Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-012
Wednesday
20 January 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-012 *20 January 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Petrovskiy Interviewed on Disarmament *[CTK]* 1
Bogachev Assesses U.S. Arms Reduction Stance 1
Officials Comment Further on Semipalatinsk *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jan]* 2
Barker 'Satisfied' *[Bogomolov in PRAVDA 16 Jan]* 2
Cruise Missile Tests Termed Step to Tension 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Briefs Journalists 19 Jan 4
Americans Granted Asylum 4
On Strategic Arms Protocol 4
Pentagon Report Assessed 4
Pope's Visit 'Not Discussed' 5
'Condemns' Israel's Actions 5
On U.S. Contra Funding 5
Gerasimov Interviewed on Role as Spokesman *[Sofia POGLED No 2]* 5
Zagladin Views Impact of 15 Jan 86 Statement *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Jan]* 8
Petrovskiy Interviewed on 42d UNGA Session *[PRAVDA 12 Jan]* 10
'Top Priority' Program Views Arms Control *[Pozner, Bogdanov, Moloshenko]* 12
'International Situation—Questions, Answers' *[Patsyuk, Kolesnichenko, Bogachev, Doronin, Agayants]* 16
Eastern Bloc Foreign Policy, Nicaragua Reviewed *[Orekhov in PRAVDA 17 Jan]* 16
Delors Comments on EEC-CEMA Cooperation *[PRAVDA 12 Jan]* 18
AAPSO Presidium Session Opens in Cairo 12 Jan *[PRAVDA 13 Jan]* 18
Cairo Session Continues 19
Greetings Cabled to Gorbachev 19

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Launches Minuteman-1 in System Test 20
New U.S. Radar Stations Add Increased Tension *[Vavilov]* 20
Reagan Approves Proposed Space Policy 20
CIA Plans To Create Internal Front in Nicaragua 21
Reagan Reiterates Support for Nicaraguan Contras 21
U.S. Response to Ortega's San Jose Proposal *[Medvedenko]* 21
U.S. Strategy in Nicaragua 'Unchanged' 22
Further Report 22
Gorbunov Comments 22
U.S. Observers Respond to 'Peace Offensive' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Jan]* 23
Deputy Premier Kamentsev Receives Hammer *[PRAVDA 14 Jan]* 24
Tolkunov Meets With Visiting Congressmen *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 24
Congressman Lantos Comments on USSR Visit *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jan]* 24
Kamentsev Receives Visiting U.S. Congressmen *[PRAVDA 16 Jan]* 25
Senator Bradley Interviewed on Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 25
Comments on Visit *[PRAVDA 16 Jan]* 26
Addition to Demichev-Bradley Meeting *[PRAVDA 14 Jan]* 26
Science Academy Presidents Hail Accord *[PRAVDA 14 Jan]* 26

China

Soviet-Chinese Trade, Cooperation Viewed 27
Alekseyev on Soviet Aid 27
Opponents of Rapport Chided 27
Comparison of Report on Deng Anthology 28

Northeast Asia

DPRK Envoy Denies Involvement in Plane Incident 28
DPRK Proposal for Joint Meeting Viewed 28
No Tae-u Proposes 'Nonparty' Government 29
Demichev Meets Japanese Art Gallery Executive *[PRAVDA 1' Jan]* 29
'New Facts' in Japanese Container Spy Case 30

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Hun Sen Stops in Moscow En Route to Paris 30
Meets Gusev During Stopover *[PRAVDA 16 Jan 88]* 30
Departs Moscow for Paris 30
Meets Sihanouk in Paris 30
Construction Cooperation With Vietnam Expanded *[Hanoi]* 30

Near East & South Asia

Belyakov Views Mubarak Tour of Arab States *[PRAVDA 20 Jan]* 31
Najibullah Addresses Reconciliation Commission *[PRAVDA 17 Jan]* 31
Afghanistan Reconciliation Period Reviewed 32
U.S. 'Information Imperialism' in South Asia 33
Talyzin Receives PDRY Planning Minister 34

East Europe

Jakes on Past, Present Role of 'Vanguard Force' *[PRAVDA 16 Jan]* 34

West Europe

More on Shevardnadze's Visit to West Germany 34
Meets With Leaders *[PRAVDA 20 Jan]* 34
Meets Communist Party Leader 36
Meets Greens Party Leaders 36
Holds News Conference *[PRAVDA 20 Jan]* 37
Departs FRG for Spain 39
Outcome of Shevardnadze Visit to FRG Surmised 39
Borin Assesses Shevardnadze Arms Proposals 40
FRG Envoy Sees Potential for Broader Soviet Ties *[PRAVDA 15 Jan]* 40
Shevardnadze Pays Official Visit to Spain 42
Visit Previewed 42
Arrives in Madrid 20 Jan 42
Statement at Airport 42
Ryzhkov Holds News Conference in Norway *[PRAVDA 16 Jan]* 43
Norwegian Reactions to Ryzhkov Visit Noted *[PRAVDA 17 Jan]* 45
Gorbachev Replies to Italian Friendship Note 46
Britain's Updating of Tank Forces Assessed *[Sayenko]* 46
British Business Delegation Visits Moscow 47
British Amity Group on Soviet Disarmament Role 47

Latin America & Caribbean

TASS Links CIA, Contras to Drug Smuggling *[Staroselkiy]* 48
Central American Settlement Prospects Viewed *[Korionov in PRAVDA 20 Jan]* 48

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Party, Government Resolution on Employment *[PRAVDA 19 Jan]* 50
Razumovskiy Visits Uzbekistan 11-13 Jan *[PRAVDA 14 Jan]* 53
Brezhnev's Secretary Jailed for Corruption *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jan]* 54
Commerce, Industry Presidium Chairman Replaced 58
Officials Interviewed on Psychiatry Decree *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 58
Local Party's Handling of Voluntary Club Hit *[PRAVDA 15 Jan]* 60
Kirghiz MVD Chief Outlines New Glasnost Policy 62
Krasnodar Officials Struggle With Prostitution 62
Changes in Environmental Protection Viewed 63
Roy Medvedev on Dubcek's L'UNITA Interview
[Rome LA REPUBBLICA, Milan L'UNITA 12 Jan] 64

Economic

Bogomolov on Financial 'Experiment' in Ukraine 64
'Problems' of Perestroyka To Air Biweekly 65
Cooperatives' Methods, Main Concern Reviewed *[Protsenko in IZVESTIYA 9 Jan]* 66
Belyanova on Plan, Market Polemics of Twenties *[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 2]* 67
Briefs 70
New Power Plant 70
Caspian Sea Oil Extraction 70

Agricultural

January Weather, Crop Status Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 Jan]* 71
Briefs 71
New Winter Wheat Strain 71

Scientific

Soviet Shuttle To Be Launched 'Soon' 71
'Mir' Cosmonauts Continue Experiments 71
Gromyko Presents Awards to 'Mir' Cosmonauts 72
Research Ship Leaves for Antarctic 72

Military

Yazov, Writers on Education of Army, Public 73

Petrovskiy Interviewed on Disarmament
LD200948 Prague CTK in English 0900 GMT 20 Jan 88

[Text] Prague Jan 20 (CTK)—New international thinking does not count with a balance of figures but with a balance of interests which seems to be reached for the first time in the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy said in an interview carried by RUDE PRAVO today.

The USA and the Soviet Union have got into the same situation, they have good prospects for the further process of nuclear disarmament. Both the USA and the Soviet Union are the winners, he said.

He pointed out that balance of interests means organically linked interests of one state with the interests of the whole mankind.

Vladimir Petrovskiy further dealt with the fact that despite the signing of the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of a whole class of nuclear weapons, the West leaves in Europe a number of nuclear weapons, some of them having the capacity of medium-range missiles. In this connection he said that the present talks focus on American submarine launched medium-range missiles. The Soviet Union urges the solving of this problem. It considers sea launched cruise missiles strategic weapons. Today, they are part of talks on strategic weapons as the Soviet Union regards them a significant part of talks with the USA on the possibility to reduce the strategic weapons arsenal to fifty per cent.

The navy is another great problem alarming the Soviet Union, the Soviet deputy foreign minister further said, adding that this question has not yet been included in talks with the USA.

The USA has been trying to avoid this problem by all means. The Soviet proposals are well known, they were put forward recently by Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov. The Soviet Union proposes an immediate opening of consultations between the Warsaw treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty, he said.

In another part of the interview Vladimir Petrovskiy said that the Soviet Union deems that talks on conventional arms reduction must be closely linked with the all-European process and must be held with the participation of all European states, including nonaligned and neutral countries.

There exists asymmetry in the sphere of conventional weapons: The Soviet Union proposes a just solution to this question—military experts and asymmetry and start eliminating it so that all conventional weapons be reduced to a lower level, the Soviet representative said.

He pointed out that it would not be correct to link the question of progress in the sphere of conventional weapons with further progress in the sphere of nuclear disarmament and said that experiences from previous talks showed that the policy of linking things together is equally outdated as the policy of dividing the spheres of interest. It is necessary to advance parallelly in all directions but as regards conventional weapons, it is necessary to start immediately. "We did not sign the treaty in Washington in order to start a new round of the arms race in the sphere of conventional weapons to the level of reasonable sufficiency. We wish to hold the talks without preliminary conditions and unbiased", Vladimir Petrovskiy said.

Bogachev Assesses U.S. Arms Reduction Stance
LD192027 Moscow TASS in English 2005 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

The United States at strategic offensive arms reduction talks in Geneva has embarked on a policy rejecting the principle of eliminating weapons systems in a mutually acceptable way, a principle which was confirmed during the latest Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington.

The United States is now attempting to reduce to nought the agreed equal limits on strategic offensive arms delivery systems (1,600 on each side) and on warheads on them (6,000) and insisting that a 3,300-warhead sublimit be imposed on land-based missiles (ICBM's).

Why is Washington's proposal for the sublimit on warheads carried on ICBM's unacceptable?

The matter is that, while there is rough parity between the Soviet and U.S. strategic forces, these forces have different makeups.

The Soviet Union has more ICBM's whereas the U.S. has over 80 percent of its nuclear munitions on submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM's) and heavy bombers (or several times more than the number of warheads on the corresponding Soviet delivery vehicles).

By suggesting a special sublimit for warheads on ICBM's, in which an advantage is held by the Soviet Union, the American side is out to make the USSR carry out a costly reorganization of its strategic forces, while enabling the Pentagon to limit itself to only cosmetic cuts in U.S. forces.

The Japanese newspaper ASAHI said that if the U.S. 3,300-warheads-on-ICBM's proposal is accepted, "The Soviet land-based strategic nuclear arms will have to be practically halved, while the U.S. ICBM's will be wholly preserved intact".

Such U.S. ideas for strategic arms reduction are, of course, not mutually acceptable.

The joint statement at summit level, when speaking of strategic offensive arms, provided for agreeing on "a ceiling of 4,900 on the aggregate number of ICBM plus SLBM warheads within the 6,000 total".

Under this provision, each side will have the right to determine itself how many warheads it will retain on ICBM's and how many on sea-launched missiles within the allowed limit. The Soviet Union stands on the positions of the agreed statement.

The U.S. side is now attempting to revise it.

Over recent days pessimistic notes have begun to be sounded by U.S. officials in their assessments of prospects for the conclusion of a strategic offensive arms agreement. There are grounds for believing that the new assessments reflect Washington's departure from the agreed provisions of an accord on the reduction of strategic offensive arms in general.

This conclusion is confirmed by the unequal demands of the U.S. side for separate sublimits to warheads on ICBM's.

Officials Comment Further on Semipalatinsk

PM171451 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Kuvshinnikov report from the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center: "So As Not To Doubt Each Other's Honesty"]

[Text] In accordance with the 9 December 1987 joint statement by E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and G. Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, a 20-strong group of U.S. specialists headed by Ambassador R. Barker visited the Soviet nuclear test site near Semipalatinsk.

The aim of their visit was to acquaint themselves with the Soviet test site and the activities that take place there so as to gain a practical basis for the elaboration and holding of a joint verification experiment.

Replying to a question from a NEW YORK TIMES correspondent about the nature of the upcoming experiment, R. Barker, head of the U.S. delegation at the full-scale Soviet-American talks on ending nuclear tests, explained: As part of the experiment at least one explosion at each of the Soviet and the American test sites will be carried out. In both cases the sides will use their own method to assess its yield and will then compare the results obtained and draw a conclusion on the feasibility of improved measures of verification of the observance of the 1974 Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests and the 1976 Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. Confidence in reliable verification is necessary for the ratification of the treaties.

"How much information were you allowed to gather and take away with you, especially in the form of photographs?" a U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT correspondent asked.

[Barker] The Russians were excellent hosts. They acquainted us with classified information and by mutual agreement we will refrain from commenting on the nature of what we have learned. I can only assure you that the information which we were given fully meets the criteria established by Messrs Shevardnadze and Shultz. During our Soviet colleagues' visit to Nevada they will be furnished with equally detailed information.

Question from the Canadian newspaper TORONTO STAR: "Does the upcoming experiment have long-term significance?"

Answer from I. Palenykh, head of the Soviet delegation at the aforementioned talks: We are beginning with the question of the verification of the "threshold" treaties, but we do not intend to stop there. The next step should be the limitation of nuclear tests in terms of numbers and yields. And ultimately—we never lose sight of our main aim—the termination and banning of nuclear tests. "The upcoming experiment," R. Barker added, "will be a good model for future arms control agreements. It enables technical experts to pool their efforts in order to elaborate the best possible methods of verification of their observance."

Barker 'Satisfied'

PM171457 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[P. Bogomolov comment: "A Lesson in Trust"]

[Text] A lesson in mutual trust and convincing evidence of the increasing opportunities for equitable international cooperation in the most complex spheres of nuclear arms limitation—this was the keynote at the latest press conference held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center 15 January.

The measure that was being discussed had been carried out a few days before as part of the implementation of the Soviet-American accords reached during the Washington summit. In accordance with the joint statement issued 9 December of last year by E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and G. Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, 20 U.S. specialists, accompanied by Soviet experts, visited the nuclear test site near Semipalatinsk a few days ago.

The U.S. experts, who were given exhaustive answers to the questions which interested them during this visit, were acquainted on the spot in detail with the organization of the work at the test site, including the operations procedure in the preparation and conducting of nuclear tests and the various methods used in assessing the yield of explosions. Now a group of Soviet experts is to cross the ocean in order to visit the test site in the state of Nevada.

Answering journalists' questions, Ambassador R. Barker, the head of the U.S. delegation, expressed satisfaction at the fullness of the information provided at the Soviet test site. He expressed confidence that the return visit by Soviet specialists will also take place in a constructive atmosphere under the sign of reciprocal hospitality.

Both sides' representatives noted at the press conference that it is planned to discuss the materials containing the end results of their joint work in Semipalatinsk and Nevada at the full-scale talks in Geneva on questions connected with the problem of nuclear tests.

Cruise Missile Tests Termed Step to Tension

LD190952 Moscow TASS in English 0926 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—The recent test of American cruise missiles over Canadian territory, although not contradicting the Soviet-U.S. agreement on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles, is a step towards developing nuclear weapons and, consequently, towards a build-up of international tensions, Geliy Batenin, a military expert at the CPSU Central Committee, told a TASS diplomatic correspondent.

The test of cruise missiles in Canada can be viewed as a concrete manifestation of the efforts by certain circles in the USA to compensate for the "losses", which the American Armed Forces would allegedly incur as a result of the forthcoming reduction of medium- and shorter-range missiles.

According to reports of news agencies, a cruise missile will be fired today from a US Air Force bomber in the area of Beaufort Sea. It will fly over the northern regions of the country and land north east of the city of Edmonton in Alberta.

Gerasimov Briefs Journalists 19 Jan

Americans Granted Asylum

LD191514 Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet (national parliament) has granted political asylum to a married couple from the United States, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told reporters at a briefing here today.

Gerasimov, chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, said:

"Theodore and Cheryl Branch of Pennsylvania, who arrived in the USSR as tourists last December, declared their unwillingness to return to the United States and asked Soviet authorities for permission to take up permanent residence in this country as political emigrants.

"In a letter to the Supreme Soviet Presidium they explained their decision by being convinced that in the Soviet Union priority is given to law and order and that socialism offers real opportunities for everyone in society."

The spokesman added that the Branches, who were experts in media matters, would be provided with jobs in keeping with their speciality and that they had already been given accomodation.

On Strategic Arms Protocol

LD191352 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—The Soviet delegation to talks with the United States on nuclear and space arms has tabled a draft protocol to a future treaty between the two countries on the reduction and limitation of their strategic offensive arms, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said today.

Gerasimov, chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, was speaking at a breifing here for Soviet and foreign reporters.

"When submitting the document, the Soviet side was guided by the instruction, recorded in the Soviet-U.S. statement that was issued after last December's summit in Washington, for the delegations to deal as a matter of priority with the issues concerning the relationship between cuts in strategic offensive arms and compliance with the ABM Treaty and to work out an agreement that would commit the sides to observe the ABM Treaty, as signed in 1972, and not to withdraw from it, for a specified period of time," he said.

Gerasimov added that the Soviet side held a flexible position on the forum of an accord on abidance by the ABM Treaty.

"We now suggested making it in the form of a protocol to a treaty on strategic offensive arms. But we do not rule out the possibility of signing it as a protocol to the ABM Treaty.

"Finally, we do not object to relevant provisins being reflected directly in the treat on strategic offensive arms either.

"In any case, this kind of accord must enter into force at the same time with the treaty on strategic offensive arms and have the same legal status as that treaty and the ABM Treaty.

"This is dictated by the organic relationship existing between the reduction of strategic offensive arms and strict compliance with the ABM Treaty," Gerasimov said.

Pentagon Report Assessed

LD191459 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman today described as a "sample of old thinking" the Pentagon report submitted to the U.S. President last week.

Among its authors were Under Secretary of Defence Fred Ikle, Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski.

"This report is an attempt to apply outdated methods of handling the security problem to new realities," said Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate.

"The authors of the report put forward their theories on the basis of purely power approaches and proceeding from the fatal inevitability of continued military rivaly, preservation of confrontation in Soviet-American relations and perpetuation of regional conflicts."

"The report does admit, although indirectly, that the arms race had led the strategic thought into a blind-alley. The recipes, offered by the authors, however, are capable only of creating new blind-alleys. Of special concern is the recommendation to step up preparations for offensive military operations, including combat operations deep inside enemy territory."

The Foreign Ministry spokesman expressed the regret that the group of influential American politicians had produced a document the tone and contents of which sharply contrasted with the latest positive trends in the world and in Soviet-American relations.

Pope's Visit 'Not Discussed'

LD191503 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—"According to reports of some news agencies Pope John Paul II allegedly said during his meeting with journalists at the association of foreign press in Rome on January 17, that he wished to visit the Soviet Union, if some of his conditions are met," Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, told Soviet and foreign journalists at a briefing here today.

"As far as we know, the pontiff's visit to the Soviet Union is not discussed in Moscow," Gerasimov said.

'Condemns' Israel's Actions

LD191528 Moscow TASS in English 1519 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—"The Soviet Union resolutely condemns Israel's unlawful acts against the Palestinian people, the systematic violation of the norms of international law, the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the UN," Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman, Gennadiy Gerasimov, told a briefing today.

"We demand that Israeli authorities immediately end arbitrariness and violence against Palestinians, unconditionally respect basic human rights, and comply with the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the protection of civilians during war. All responsibility for the tragic situation on the occupied Arab territories rests with Israel."

The Soviet point of view, which was repeatedly expressed in public, was brought to the notice of the Israeli Government at today's meeting in Helsinki between representatives of the Foreign Ministries of the USSR and Israel, Gennadiy Gerasimov said.

The Soviet side stressed in the course of the meeting that the main obstacle to establishing peace in the Middle East was Israel's obstructionist stand. It was pointed out that the only way leading to a comprehensive and just settlement was to convene a fully-authorised international conference with the participation of all directly involved sides, including Israel and the PLO as well as permanent members of the Security Council. For its part, the Soviet Union is ready to take vigorous efforts in this direction.

"We have again called on the Government of Israel to join in the current consensus in the world in favour of convening such a conference," Gennadiy Gerasimov said," and in the honest collective search for peace on the basis of a balance of the legitimate interests of all states and peoples of the region."

Separate issues of technical nature, touched upon by the Israeli side, also came up for discussion at the Helsinki meeting. "A possibility was considered in principle to send to Moscow for a brief period several Israeli Ministry officials to familiarise themselves with the work of the department of the Dutch Embassy on protecting the interests of Israel," the Soviet spokesman said. "Of course, without any linkage to the work of the group of consular workers of the USSR Foreign Ministry in Tel Aviv. The concrete date for the trip is yet to be fixed."

"As for the question of restoring diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel," said Gennadiy Gerasimov, "the Soviet side has reaffirmed that shifts in this area were only possible within the process of the Middle Eastern settlement."

On U.S. Contra Funding

LD191637 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—"The main and encouraging result of the meeting held by the presidents of the five Central American countries in San Jose is an expression of their readiness to continue efforts to resolve the existing crisis situation in the region through political means, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, said today at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. [quote marks as received]

"Of special importance in this context are new, extremely important moves by the Nicaraguan Government which showed its desire for promoting actively normalization of the situation in Central America," pointed out the USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman. "Now it is quite logical to say that a new stage in the development of the process of a Central American political settlement starts in San Jose: Additional prospects open for advancing in the direction of national reconciliation."

An end to outside interference remains a main condition for successful realization of the Guatemalan understandings. "We are convinced that a political dialogue and talks remain the only reasonable method of tackling problems existing in U.S.-Nicaraguan relations. However, according to reports coming in from Washington," said Gennadiy Gerasimov, "The American Administration intends in the near future to request Congress for new appropriations for Nicaraguan contras. We fully share the opinion of Latin Americans that such an action will only result in expanding the scale of the U.S. aggression in Central America."

Gerasimov Interviewed on Role as Spokesman

AU141024 Sofia POGLED in Bulgarian Issue No 2 11 Jan 88 pp 1, 8-9

[Report on interview with Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by Valeri Naydenov, BTA Moscow correspondent "especially for POGLED"; date not given; first 12 paragraphs are POGLED introduction]

[Text] Every new period in social and political life requires new personalities, especially with regard to an important field of activity, such as the formation of public opinion and struggle for the victory of the new philosophy of peace.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, the man who faces crossfire from journalists several times a week, has no intention of deviating from Lenin's postulate that truth should be known, regardless of whose interest it serves.

Gennadiy Gerasimov was born in 1930 in Kazan, where his father was a physician. At the beginning of the war, his father was mobilized and sent to the Far East with his family. This is where Gennadiy finished his eighth school year, after which he returned to Kazan, where he continued his studies. From 1948 to 1953, he attended the Moscow Institute of International Relations. After graduation he tried to pursue an academic career, but he was soon disappointed and devoted himself to journalism. He worked for the periodical NOVOYE VREMYA, for the daily TRUD, and for the journal PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM at the Prague headquarters.

Later on, he was recruited by the CPSU Central Committee where he worked for 3 years. In 1967 he joined the newly established group of NOVOSTI political commentators, and he spent the period from 1972 to 1977 as a correspondent of this new agency in the United States.

As an experienced journalist, he was appointed editor in chief of the daily MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in 1983, and 3 years later, he became chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Valeri Naydenov, BTA correspondent in Moscow, interviewed Gennadiy Gerasimov especially for POGLED.

Whatever question you may ask, concerning missiles, or "heavy metal," about oil tanker wars, foggy airports, earthquakes, or AIDS, you can ask Gennadiy Gerasimov, and you can be sure that he will answer you, if not immediately, at least in a few days.

Western correspondents gave him the nickname "Glasnost Gerasimov", which is meant as a joke but which is quite justified. Even if the "Guiness Book of Records" remains silent on this subject, we can be sure that he has attained the record for satisfying journalists' curiosity, at least as regards the last 1 and 1/2 years.

At his very first press conference as chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Gerasimov caused a sensation with his new style.

It is a well-known fact that there are two kinds of attitude to this work: to say things, or to demonstrate them. Gennadiy Gerasimov prefers the latter method. Instead of ready-made evaluations, he provides facts. His style is usually concise, often ironic, but always precise. As the Russians say, he does not have to search through his pockets for an answer. Our more militant Western colleagues soon realized that there is no question on which they could "nail him down," and this earned him their respect.

Glasnost in Soviet foreign policy introduced a drastic change in the lives of foreign correspondents in Moscow. It is as if they had changed from riding trains to boarding aircraft. The international press center in Moscow quickly reached and exceeded its "designed capacity." The press conferences, which used to be held monthly, became daily. Sometimes there is even more than one per day, planned in advance, or improvised, dealing with the most varied subjects. There are so many interesting events that, if you happen to "catch" one, you may miss ten others.

In the past, journalists complained that they were not sufficiently informed, that it was difficult for them to meet Soviet officials, Gennadiy Gerasimov says. Now they complain about too many press conferences, although, as you know, attendance at them is by no means obligatory. It is entirely up to the journalists whether they wish to attend or not.

[Naydenov] My colleagues say that the press center does not even leave them time to read the newspapers. How do you find the time to prepare so many press conferences? How large is your staff?

[Gerasimov] After the directorate was established, we decided to hold the so-called briefings on current foreign policy questions twice a week and more often, if necessary. All departments of our ministry were instructed to assist us. We hold weekly meetings with department chiefs and directorate members, at which they tell us what is happening in the respective geographical areas they are dealing with, what kind of news is to be expected, and what kind of questions we may be asked in this connection. I work with 12 assistants, each of them responsible for a different area's problems. Preparing the answers is only part of their work; in addition to dealing with journalists, they deal with foreign embassies as well.

[Naydenov] Are there questions that you find difficult to answer?

[Gerasimov] There are no "provocative" questions, in my opinion. Only those questions on which I have no information are difficult for me. In such cases it is useless to beat about the bush: I just admit that I do not know the answer, but I will inquire and reply later.

That questions postponed are usually not concerned with foreign policy issues. Take for example, where Mathias Rust is detained: whether he is in a camp or a prison. Or take the famous trailers of the two radar stations: the journalists asked what exact purpose they are supposed to serve. I know they were useful for our national economy, but I did not know the details. A

specialist came to the next briefing and explained everything. This was not a foreign policy question either, but since the Ministry of Radio Industry has no spokesman, the answer was provided by our press center.

[Naydenov] Nevertheless, in many cases such specific questions lead to the opening of certain subjects which until recently were considered "off limits." Thus, for example, a year ago you were questioned about the number of AIDS cases in the USSR.

[Gerasimov] Naturally, I could not know these figures. However, it was easy to contact the Ministry of Health and to learn about them. I also had to comment on the subject; therefore, I said that every revolution has its thermidor. Such is the case of sexual revolution, which has now reached its thermidor. As to the figures, they are subject to change, and we are announcing them openly.

As far as the subject of statistics is concerned, this area is gradually being "opened" in our country. As a journalist, in the past I always fought for glasnost about demographic figures. Life expectancy suddenly stopped increasing in our country, and in the case of male citizens, it even dropped. Instead of revealing the reasons for this process, we began to withhold figures. Numerous demographers protested against this; journalists also voiced their protest, but it was the time of stagnation. This, however, belongs to the past: We now openly announce statistical data on life expectancy, on the mortality rate, and on drug addiction.

[Naydenov] Your are actually an expert on everything, not only foreign policy....

[Gerasimov] In the field of glasnost, our ministry was certainly the first but not the last. Regular press conferences are given by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and by the Ministry of Health. Other ministries are expected to follow their example soon. We welcome this development. It is true that we are currently the press center for the whole union, but we do not insist on this monopoly.

[Naydenov] Other countries have a government spokesman; is one needed here, too?

[Gerasimov] This is a difficult question. There is one in Poland—Jerzy Urban. I visited him and saw how he works. He is doing a good job. Several ministries provide him with information, including the Foreign Ministry. The situation is somewhat different in our country. However, the important thing is how things further develop and what our experience will reveal. At this stage, I think everyone is satisfied with the press center.

When I accompanied Eduard Shevardnadze to Washington, we gave a joint press conference with Charles Redman, who is the spokesman of the U.S. State Department. However, when I was there with Mikhail Gorbachev, my counterpart was Marlin Fitzwater, the White House press secretary.

The function of USSR "spokesman" in itself is something new: It is approximately as old as glasnost. It is new as a social necessity and as a practice.

Let us deviate a little from our subject. According to the well-known definition of Karl Marx, information in administrative organizations follows a dual current: The main things move from top to bottom, while details move from the bottom to the top. Everything remains within the department.

Indeed, it is sometimes necessary to go beyond the framework of the administration, but this is being done in a very specific form, devoid of any vulgarity, in the form of a pure idea. We journalists strive to facilitate the expression of this idea and annoy people with additional questions—when, how, how many times, and so forth. What can we do, the readers are curious. From the point of view of administrative norms, this is certainly not nice.... [Gerasimov ends]

[Unattributed interpolation] In the era of fundamental changes, such as the period of restructuring, the struggle to mobilize civic consciousness is beginning. This is the right time to remove the administrative restrictions on broad vertical movement of information, despite the fact that such information can be controversial.

This is the epicenter of glasnost. The spokesman must be a politician as well as a journalist, and something more. What exactly? This is difficult to define; perhaps Gennadiy Gerasimov can answer this question. As a journalist who still regularly writes a weekly column for the daily SOVYIETSKAYA KULTURA, he is well-aware of the value of details, such as whether Rust is in prison or in a camp, or whether such and such a minister is in the hospital, details which may seem tiresome from the other point of view. As a politician he understands the main substance of the issues, and how it should be emphasized. As a spokesman he understands how important it is to tell everything, with openness, without beating around the bush, without insinuations, and with a feeling of respect for journalists.

The third element, presumably, is a certain human quality in support of Lenin's postulate that truth should be known, regardless of whose interest it serves.

Glasnost in foreign policy is also one of Lenin's postulates. In our times, it truly picked up steam after the Chernobyl accident. The open information on the disaster seemed to unite people, and promptly turned disadvantages into advantages.

It is true that some people are still in doubt, asking themselves whether the Soviet Union has not gone too far in revealing nuclear firing grounds and "ultra-secret" radar equipment, as well as by making public its chemical weapon resources.

[Naydenov] Has glasnost been useful for your diplomacy?

[Gerasimov] There is no doubt about this. In the past, hostile intentions were attributed to us, and one thought that we were striving for world domination. We were called the "evil empire," and if all these delusions have been dispelled, it is mainly due to glasnost.

Actually, we had nothing to hide, even in the past. However, we had presumably not understood and estimated well enough how important it is to be frank. Here are the results: According to opinion polls in the United States, Mikhail Gorbachev's prestige is close to that of the U.S. President. This is very significant for a foreign leader, especially considering anti-Soviet propaganda. When Gorbachev stepped out of the car on Connecticut Avenue, the people in the street, without exception, greeted him with particular cordiality. After that he confided to us that he felt as if he were not in Washington, but in Bratislava....

[Naydenov] The Americans, who have always boasted about the openness of their policy, seemed more secretive. They did not wish to publish specific documents on the deployment of their missiles, since they allegedly feared the danger of terrorists. I think this happened at your joint "briefing" with Fitzwater.

[Gerasimov] This is quite true. After exchanging the final documents, an interesting fact was established: U.S. military intelligence had forged the number of Soviet missiles and warheads by increasing this number by one third, while, on the other hand, the data on U.S. missiles published in the American press to date had deliberately been reduced. This is how glasnost works to our advantage....

[Naydenov] My last question to Gennadiy Gerasimov was typical for the representative of a small country: Has he any connections with Bulgaria?

[Gerasimov] I do not know, perhaps through my family. Actually, I do have something, namely, the "Golden Pen" of the Bulgarian Journalists Union. As a correspondent in the United States, I wrote articles for the daily VECHERN NOVINI for a long time. I was something like a correspondent for this newspaper. Therefore, they invited me, and I was awarded the "Golden Pen." I spent a few days in Pamporovo and wrote an article entitled "Palm Beach—Pamporovo" in which I compared my impressions of the two resorts.

Zagladin Views Impact of 15 Jan 86 Statement

PM181621 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Jan 88 First Edition p 1

["Our Dialogue" with Vadim Zagladin by unidentified interviewer: "Implementing Mankind's Common Goal"; place and date of interview not given]

[Text] [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] "Thank you very much to all who took part in formulating and signing the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, to M.S. Gorbachev and the members of the Soviet delegation in Washington who made the coming year an open road to peace," Olga Aleksandrovna Kirpu writes from the settlement of Gornyy in Tyumen Oblast.

The editorial office receives many letters that rate highly the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. People want to look into the future and are asking about the reality of implementing the plan for building a nuclear-free world, as outlined in M.S. Gorbachev's statement of 15 January 1986. In his book "Restructuring and the New Thinking for Our Country and the Entire World" M.S. Gorbachev writes that deriving lessons from the past in order to think about the future is a science, a very serious and responsible science. How will you—one of the exponents of this science—respond to the general question from thousands of our readers: What is the lesson for the future to be derived from the experience of our own and international efforts to implement the ideas in the statement of 15 January 1986?

[Zagladin] I shall begin with the fact that 2 years ago—and M.S. Gorbachev mentioned this at his meeting at the CPSU Central Committee with the leaders of the mass media—his 15 January 1986 Statement was interpreted in the West as utopian. But now, after the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the entire world can see for itself: The so-called utopia is becoming a reality. Moreover, it is the kind of reality that will have a clearly cumulative effect. Regarding lessons for the future, I think this question should be posed thus: Why then could this "utopia" become a reality?

First and foremost, it is because the proposals made by M.S. Gorbachev on 15 January 1986 were not simply an aggregation of simply good ideas—yet ideas that were fortuitous or far divorced from real life—but an expression of a vital need for the whole human species.

The well-known saying proclaims: Mankind sets itself only those goals it is capable of achieving, that is, those placed on the agenda by the very course of events. The task of creating a nuclear-free world is indeed an urgent matter. Mankind is on the brink of possible destruction. The common will of earth's inhabitants is to prevent this.

It is far from fortuitous that it is precisely our country and its leaders who have expressed mankind's common will. Socialism is a society that has been created and is being improved for the sake of mankind, for the sake of creating optimum conditions for its life and development, and for it to reveal all the wealth of its personality. It is understandable that precisely this society is capable of expressing most fully these needs of mankind as a species.

Further, the second reason for the vitality of the ideas in the 15 January Statement is, evidently, the fact that these ideas were realistic. What does this mean? The proposals

contained in this statement do not violate anyone's interests, and, on the contrary, in the final analysis accord with the interests of each country and the entire world community. The most important, cardinal aim—ensuring mankind's survival—is linked with the proposal of a specific path leading to this goal, specific stages at which equal and guaranteed security is ensured for all peoples and for each of these peoples individually.

The strength of the Statement of 15 January 1986 is that it places the problem of survival in a broad framework, shows the close interlinkage between averting a nuclear catastrophe and resolving other global problems, and gears one precisely to this.

Finally, one more thing: The 15 January 1986 Statement immediately found its continuation in the form of concrete initiatives by the Soviet state on all questions touched upon in this document, without exception.

Consequently, this is the lesson: For the future to be guaranteed, a consistent realism is needed in the future to raise questions that really accord with life's requirements; the interests of all members of the world community need to be taken into account; a specific approach to problems is needed and, of course, unity of word and deed is essential. We have not always followed these principles, hence our foreign policy's "slippage" in the past. But now the leadership of our country and party is consistently following the chosen path. Hence the first successes achieved and the positive improvements that have begun to appear in the very atmosphere of international life.

Our proposals are making headway, albeit gradually and with difficulty. But sometimes skepticism about their feasibility in the foreseeable future is manifested not only in the West but here at home. A letter by an engineer and technologist, A.D. Devyatkin, from the city of Pushkin, near Moscow, might be cited as an example. It contains these lines:

"I do not believe in the possibility of regeneration in the consciousness of Western political figures. They have been hostile toward us for 70 years, and they will remain so in the future."

[SOVERTSKAYA ROSSIYA] You meet with many foreign political and social figures. How, in your view, are they restructuring themselves?

[Zagladin] You know, the process is varied. There is no doubt that the new thinking is making headway in the broadest circles of Western public opinion. The changes in the international climate which have begun to appear and which we have already talked about indicate this. Actions by one side alone cannot lead to such changes, of course—a corresponding response is needed from the other party.

But, first, the new thinking is by no means taking root in all instances and in all places. Take the United States. On the one hand, the effect of the idea of the new thinking can be perceived there, and in a number of cases quite obviously. On the other hand, those who are very far from these ideas are also demonstrating unrelenting vigor. A few days ago, for example, reports appeared on a report to President Reagan by the special commission for formulating recommendations on the United States' long-term strategy. This report proposes some changes as compared with the present day, but the original ideas remain as before: an orientation toward military force as a means of resolving international problems; the continuation of the arms race, albeit with some changes in emphasis; and using the threat of "Soviet aggression" as a means of intimidation.

Second, the ideas of the new thinking have still not penetrated all the way, so to speak, the majority of those inclined toward a realistic approach. There is already a realization that it is essential to avert war, and that a nuclear conflict should not be permitted. That is all very well but it is not enough. The modern concept of security presupposes not only excluding a nuclear conflict but a refusal to use force altogether, and not only in relations between the countries of the two opposing systems but also among any countries. This concept requires a political solution to emergent conflicts or disputes, taking into account the balance of the parties' reasonable interests. But we are by no means yet seeing this to the degree necessary, particularly when it is a question of local wars and conflicts engendered by egotistical, neocolonialist aspirations.

Comrade A.D. Devyatkin, evidently, is right in the sense that the majority of Western political figures will not become supporters of socialism, and will not "fall in love" with it. They are not renouncing the idea of antagonism between the two systems. But there is nothing unnatural in this.

The antagonism between the two systems will continue, but the main concern is that it develops not in military form but in the form of peaceful rivalry and competition between the two systems. Let each prove the correctness of his social choice, the correspondence of his ideals to the interests and requirements of the people. The peoples will make the conclusions. History will show who is right.

One more thing: The fact that our Western partners maintain their class approach to socialism and that we also maintain our class approach in assessing capitalism is not and should not be an obstacle to assimilating the ideas of the new thinking: These ideas and their implementation cannot signify an encroachment on some social structure, or on the internal procedures of any peoples. On the contrary, one of the cornerstones of the new thinking is unconditional respect for the rights of each people to make their own social choice. So I,

personally, am an optimist, and I hope the ideas of the new thinking will spread and that the aims set in the 15 January 1986 Statement can be reached.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] Today the effect of restructuring on the effectiveness of our foreign policy is really unquestionable; it does not require proof. But precisely which threads would you single out as the most important in this regard?

[Zagladin] First, I would like to voice one general idea. We have indeed always talked about the power of socialism's example. Indeed, it has always played its part. But we have by no means always recognized (and sometimes, evidently, we did not want to recognize) that the force of example can come in many guises. It can be positive if we are talking about the successes, achievements, and progress of the new society; it can be negative if we are talking about our misfortunes, difficulties, and shortfalls. This concerns all aspects of our society's life: economic, political and social life, and culture.

As regards the present day, the results achieved in our economic development attract attention. But they, I think, are not the main influence on the world public. Indeed, at present we are talking merely about the very start of restructuring our national economy, and the decisive improvements lie ahead. But right now, today, what plays a special role as a factor for influencing the outside world is the democratization of public life, glasnost and, on the other hand, of course, our foreign policy initiatives. It is quite natural that the economic sphere, and the scienfific and technical sphere, will play an ever increasing role in the future. Our party's plans have inspired great hopes, and these hopes must be justified.

Taken as a whole, these processes are gradually breaking down the image of the USSR as the enemy created over decades by Western propaganda and are destroying the myth of the Soviet military threat. The attractiveness of the features of socialism as the society of peace, social justice, and democracy is increasing.

One might say: Every Soviet citizen participating in the restructuring processes, absorbing its ideas, and converting these ideas into practical deeds is thus contributing to raising the effectiveness of our foreign policy, and to the progress of all mankind toward a nuclear-free world.

Petrovskiy Interviewed on 42d UNGA Session

PM141435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 88 First Edition p 4

['Conversation' with Deputy Foreign Minister V.P. Petrovskiy conducted by N. Prozhogin: "Results of the 42d UN General Assembly Session": "Potential for Renewal"; date and place not specified]

[Text] Question: The 42d UN General Assembly Session began its work when the real prospect of a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the achievement of an agreement on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles had opened up, and it ended shortly after these events took place. What influence did they have on the course of the session? What was new in its work? How did it differ from previous sessions?

Answer: The Soviet-U.S. summit and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles indisputably had a great effect on the course of the session. In their turn its participants endeavored to create a favorable international climate for the success of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue. M.S. Gorbachev's article "Reality and the Guarantees of a Secure World" was of great significance. The UN member states saw in it that the USSR is not focusing its efforts just on developing relations with the United States but is advocating that the resolution of the most important problems facing mankind be a matter for the entire international community, a matter for the United Nations. This also left a profound imprint on the work of the session and facilitated the renewal of its activity. There was seen to be an increase in the trend toward the multilateral resolution of international problems by political means on the basis of a balance of UN members' interests and the development of relations of trust and cooperation between them. This found expression in the adoption of a record number of consensual resolutions, that is, resolutions adopted by general assent—approximately one-third of the 200 adopted at this session.

The clearest illustration of the innovatory features of the session was the programmatic document concerning the creation of an all-embracing system of international peace and security. This question was put forward on the initiative of a group of socialist countries. The session approved the concept proposed by them, stressing the United Nations' special role as an indispensable instrument for seeking to balance states' interests both during the creation of such a system and in the provision of its guarantees. One can assert with complete justification that the 42d session was a landmark in the life of the United Nations.

Question: What impact is this having on the talks on disarmament questions being held under UN auspices, which in the eyes of the public have been marking time for too long?

Answer: The United Nations itself is not holding disarmament talks. It is a forum for discussions in the course of which recommendations are also drawn up on disarmament questions. The Geneva Conference on Disarmament already acts as a forum for multilateral talks on these questions. The public's justified dissatisfaction at the lack of perceptible results must relate to this conference. However, in recent times, since the USSR submitted new proposals designed to assign the Geneva conference a more active role in the disarmament process, there has been a definite shift in its work. Thus, the conference has entered the finishing straight in the formulation of a convention banning chemical weapons. If the convention has still not become a reality, this is

because not all countries, the United States above all, are ready to eliminate chemical weapons. People in Washington are verbally in favor of drawing up the convention while in practice they have decided to create binary weapons. But the Geneva conference does not exist in a vacuum. The 42d UN General Assembly Session insistently recommended the conclusion of work on the convention to eliminate chemical armaments and the achievement of perceptible results at the talks on nuclear-space problems. It is the duty of the conference participants to heed the collective opinion of the world community.

Question: What has the General Assembly done to overcome regional conflict and crisis situations in the world?

Answer: The desire to solve these questions by joint efforts as well grew during the discussion of them. The United Nations essentially regards the concept of national reconciliation as a base model for settling conflicts. A declaration on reinforcing the effectiveness of the principle of repudiating the threat or use of force in international relations—a principle laying the foundations not only for unblocking existing crises but also for preventing new ones—was adopted unanimously. The plan for a peace settlement in Central America won general support. All UN members, barring Israel and the United States, supported the idea of a peace conference on the Near East....

Question: How did discussion of the Afghan and Cambodian questions go?

Answer: Countries favoring a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan and the constructive resolution of the Cambodian question endeavored to move discussions on the relevant questions away from the course of confrontation toward dialogue and the quest for generally acceptable solutions, taking into consideration all, and not just individual, aspects of both problems. But those who want to impede their political settlement, primarily the United States, acted from positions of confrontation, and with particular bitterness on this occasion. Under these conditions, most UN members could not bring themselves to abandon the old routine, and the results of the voting remained practically unchanged in comparison with previous sessions. Nonetheless, one should not fail to point out that new elements have appeared in these discussions. The quest for a settlement on the basis of dialogue and national reconciliation is encountering much more understanding than before.

Question: Yet what is preventing the United Nations from playing a more effective role? You mentioned the United States' negative position on a number of problems under discussion. Instances when the United States even directly complicated the activity of the United Nations are also known. In this connection, letters from PRAVDA readers ask whether we should move the United Nations to another country. What is your answer to them?

Answer: In assessing UN capabilities, one must proceed on the basis that it is not a supranational organ, a superstate, or a supergovernment. It is an international organization whose effectiveness depends on the coordination with which the states represented in it act and on how strictly they adhere to the terms of the UN Charter. Of course, the United States is creating many difficulties for the United Nations. But will merely transferring its headquarters to another country help? In terms of boosting UN effectiveness and of its normal functioning, it is much more important for the states involved in the organization, above all the permanent members of the Security Council, to act responsibly and for those states on whose territory the United Nations and its organs are located to set an example of good hospitality in their attitude toward it.

Question: How are things with the United Nations' financial difficulties?

Answer: They are serious, and they are caused by the United States—one of the main contributors to its budget—refusing to pay its dues in full, alluding to the fact that the United Nations is allegedly costing it too much. This is, of course, a joke. A book published recently in the United States, "The United Nations—In or Out," points out that the annual UN budget would not be enough to maintain the Pentagon for a single day. The real reason for the U.S. stand lies elsewhere. The policy guidelines of an influential U.S. conservative organization, the Heritage Foundation, which regards the United Nations as an instrument of U.S. national policy rather than of international concord, have revealed this. Hence the dissatisfaction with the fact that most UN members vote much more frequently with the USSR than with the United States. But the results of the voting, as experience shows, do not depend on its members' use of coercion and pressure (although there have been occasions when some have succumbed to this) but above all on how far a particular country's foreign policy positions conform with the predominant mood in the United Nations.

Question: The second anniversary of the publication of the 15 January 1986 Statement by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, containing a plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the beginning of the 21st century, is almost upon us. What steps can the United Nations take this year to facilitate the implementation of this plan?

Answer: We have already said to you that the signing of the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the first real step toward creating a nonnuclear world, had a favorable influence on the work of the General Assembly session. This treaty and the emergent prospect

for an agreement on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive armaments are creating the preconditions for an enhanced UN role also in the work of advancing toward a nonnuclear world and eliminating all means of mass destruction. This year provides a good opportunity for this: the Third UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament Questions. It can give new impetus to the resolution of these questions. I will also mention that the USSR has proposed to proclaim the nineties the decade of building a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. We hope not only this proposal will be met with understanding within the United Nations but that it will also be of practical importance.

Question: Including in terms of preventing the militarization of space?

Answer: Indisputably. This is confirmed by the discussions of the 42d session. All UN members—again, unfortunately, with the exception of the United States—advocated accords excluding the placement of weapons in space and favored international cooperation in the peaceful development of space. The Soviet-U.S. meeting in Washington revealed the possibilities that are opening up here, right up as far as a flight to Mars. We believe an international organization must be created to successfully develop peaceful cooperation in space alongside bilateral efforts. It could exist either within the framework of the United Nations or have autonomous status along the lines of the International Atomic Energy Agency. With two such powerful "wings," the United Nations could play the role of guarantor of a nonnuclear, nonviolent world.

Question: In short, a great field of activity is opening up before the United Nations?

Answer: Yes, although it is clear that a complex struggle lies ahead. The experience of restructuring in domestic and international affairs illustrates that we must not underestimate the counteractive effect of the braking mechanisms. But the UN General Assembly 42d Session showed that the potential for renewing the activity of the United Nations is sufficiently strong. This inspires optimism.

'Top Priority' Program Views Arms Control

LD171334 Moscow World Service in English 0710 GMT 17 Jan 88

["Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Pozner with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Igor Moloshenko]

[Text] [Pozner] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. This is Vladimir Pozner, presenting "Top Priority". With me on the panel today, as usual, Doctors Radomir Bogdanov and Igor Moloshenko. I should say, of course, not as usual, because you're more used to Sergey Plekhanov, however. Where is Sergey today, Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] He's ill.

[Pozner] He's ill?

[Moloshenko] He's not ill, he's sick, well.

[Pozner] He's sick?

[Moloshenko] Yes.

[Pozner] Well that's the same thing actually, depends whether you speak English or American. [laughs]

[Bogdanov] He has a fever.

[Pozner] He has the fever, I see, OK.

[Moloshenko] Well, I always thought in school that it's not the same thing.

[Pozner] No, exactly. You learned your English the English way.

[Bogdanov] The best English is Mr Pozner's school

[Pozner, interrupting] Well, I'm afraid...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Let's not forget that.

[Pozner] I thank you very much Dr Bogdanov, but I'm afraid that our friends in Great Britain would not agree with you. But now to get on with our own, with our subject for today's "Top Priority". (?Now) 2 years ago, on 15 January 1986, General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev proposed a step-by-step plan to achieve a nuclear-free world by the year 2000. That was 2 years ago, and in the 2 years that have ensued we have seen some major progress. Of course the most obvious is the recent INF Treaty signed by the leaders of our two respective countries, the USSR and the United States. As we talk now in Geneva, the representatives of the two countries are discussing ways to reach an agreement on a 50 percent reduction of nuclear offensive strategic weapons.

So perhaps the drram of doing away with nuclear weapons is not just a dream but also a reality. Let's look at it. There are some great difficulties: difficulties of a physical nature and difficulties of a psychological nature. Dr Bogdanov, what are your feelings?

[Bogdanov] My feelings are very high feelings....

[Pozner, interrupting] high?

[Bogdanov] I would say, yeah. You know, the first thing which comes to my mind is that only 2 years after the famous nonnuclear world statement of General Secretary Gorbachev, mind you only 2 years, what we have achieved already, we have achieved already a treaty on liquidation of INF and lesser range missiles. Let me remind you, my friends around this table and our American listeners, that this plan had in mind three stages, and the first stage was for liquidation of three

things: Number 1, strategic offensive weapons; number 2, INF; and number 3, banning of nuclear weapons. And the first stage was meant for 5-8 years. Two years passed. What we...

[Pozner, interrupting] You mean that it would take 5-8 years to achieve that first stage?

[Bogdanov] To achieve that first stage, that three things I have mentioned.

[Pozner, interrupting] Right.

[Bogdanov] But within 2 years, we have already achieved one.

[Pozner, interrupting] One of those goals.

[Bogdanov] One of those goals which was in the middle of that, of that (?turn). Now, what I'm aiming at, if we go like that... So, first of all, it's realistic, it's realistic. If we come back to the beginning of that period, of the nonnuclear war period, you well remember as anybody else that people, what people mainly were saying: No, it's an illusion, it's a dream, it's something which never could be achieved. Now it is one very important part of that which is on the table.

[Pozner, interrupting] Yes.

[Bogdanov] We still have, if we have in mind between 5-8 years to achieve major goals of the first stage we have quite a number of years. If we go with the same tempo, with the same velocity, if you like, we can well achieve another very important stage, like 50% cuts in strategic weapons. And if you keep in mind that we have already started talking about stopping, banning all the nuclear tests, then we may well think that it's very realistic, it's really within the reach.

[Pozner] Dr Bogdanov, you've surprised me today. You're usually in our dicussions. Igor, you may not be aware of this because you don't participate as often, but let me tell you that Dr Bogdanov in these discussions is always the more pessimistic....

[Moloshenko] Well, today I'm playing this role.

[Pozner] I see, because what you have said, Dr Bogdanov, is very upbeat. I mean, you seem to be saying that we have it made, that it's all going to happen; everything is fine.

[Bogdanov] Vladimir, you have it on the table. You have hard facts on the table. We are not talking about something soft. We are talking about hardware [as heard]. I mean the treaty is on the table....

[Pozner] Dr Moloshenko, you wanted to pour some cold water on this warm discussion of ours?

[Moloshenko] Well, yes. I remember very well when 2 years ago I saw for the first time, I read the statement on nuclear-free world, I decided that the idea is too good to be true. And still being friends with you, I am still a little bit agnostic in this respect.

[Pozner] Agnostic?!

[Moloshenko] Agnostic because I am not so sure. [laughter]

[Pozner] You mean by that nonbelieving, right? I'm not sure our listeners, would you please then explain what you mean by agnostic?

[Moloshenko] Well, I don't know, is it feasible or not to achieve a nuclear-free world especially in the year 2000? I don't know. I hope it's possible but I don't know; I'm not sure about it. This is my meaning [word indistinct] of what agnostic meant. Well, but you know something's really changed during these 3 [as heard] years. Yes OK, we received this INF Treaty, but there is very important difference of physical and psychological realities. Physically, we are going to destroy about 4% of the nuclear arsenals. Psychologically, I think it's much more important than so to say 4% solution of this problem, because for the first time the trend was reversed. But still, you know, I think that there are major problems with, with our mentality because we can't, I can't—OK, let me speak in personal terms.

[Pozner] It's always better to do that, yes.

[Moloshenko] Yes, sure. I can imagine rather easily the world with 95% cuts of nuclear weapons.

[Pozner] You can imagine that?

[Moloshenko] Yes, I can imagine, after all it is proved, so to say. There are major studies made both in the Soviet Union and in the United States by the most respectable experts who show that it's possible to have 95% cuts and still have some kind of strategic stability. But a lot of people were still very hesitant about, you know, compelte disappearance, complete destruction of nuclear weapons.

[Pozner] And you're one of them?

[Moloshenko] Well, you know, I can understand them very well.

[Pozner] You can understand them?

[Moloshenko] Yes, I would like to see a nuclear-free world, but I'm not so much sure about the feasibility of this idea. But I would like to make two points: that even with 5% of, it's too early you know to quarrel about this elimination of the rest of 5% of nuclear weapons. We still have enormous stockpiles of nuclear weapons, and it's a little bit too premature to quarrel about this 5%. This is

point number one. The second point is that even without nuclear weapons we would still have some kind of nuclear deterrence, fortunately or unfortunately, because you know, in Europe, let's talk just about Europe, we have 200 nuclear power stations, and it means that we'll have a nuclear deterrent because in the case of war... [Bogdanov attempts to interrupt]

[Pozner] I think, just a minute, Dr Bogdanov, what you're saying then is, you know, let's go for 95%, and when we get to that we'll see what the 5%, what to do with them. Is that what you're saying, really?

[Moloshenko] Yes...

[Pozner, interrupting] Right, Dr Bogdanov.

[Moloshenko] That's correct, and I'm saying more than that.

[Pozner] Igor, you're saying more than that?

[Moloshenko] Yes.

[Pozner] You're saying?

[Moloshenko] Yes, I say that the world should change so much in the process of this 95% reduction

[Pozner, interrupting] The mentality?

[Moloshenko] The mentality, the political climate, everything. So that it should be, you know, a completely new political situation.

[Pozner] Right. Dr Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Igor, I respect very much your views, but I do not agree with your views. Let me, let me [words indistinct] I'm, I'm sorry but I would like jsut to say something against what you have said just now. No 1: Not you but some other people today while talking about the achievements, the success, they say, what is this success, 5%? Some people say between 4% and 5%. But let me say what does it mean, 5% or even 4% for Europe? It's 200 World War II's, 200. Can you imagine that?

[Pozner] In fact, you mean the explosive power.

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Yeah, explosive power.

[Pozner] 200 times what happened during World War II for Europe. OK, alright.

[Bogdanov] No 2: We destroy the most sophisticated, most technologically advanced warheads. No 3: And why do you forget that—I am little bit surprised—that we have a major breakthrough in just the mentality business, and I mean by that verification, control and verification, which makes possible, I believe in that very strongly, which makes possible another major breakthrough in strategic offensive business? That's what I mean. I understand your pessimism, I understand, I'm not as jubilant as you say, no, I have my own reservations, but still I insist that you have that on the table, and if I ask you, Igor, and if you're honest enough to give an honest answer, if somebody asked you about 2 years ago, is that possible or not Mr Moloshenko, what you would say?

[Moloshenko] I would say no. But you didn't mention one important point which I made. I said that psychologically and politically the importance of the INF treaty is enormous. It was a real breakthrough. I made this point so...

[Pozner, interrupting] Yes, absolutely yes. I was going to come in for you there and...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Maybe, I'm sorry, maybe I missed it, but...

[Moloshenko, interrupting] I'm not pessimistic, I'm agnostic and I will say it's an educated optimism or...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] By the way, you know, he has a philosophical education, he has a master's degree in philosophy.

[Pozner] I see. [words indistinct]

[Bogdanov] And I'm a trained historian, you know. We have very different...

[Pozner, interrupting] Yes, I've heard you say that you were a student of (?that), Dr Bogdanov.

[Moloshenko] Professor Bogdanov, I tend to regard my philosophical background as an asset, not as a liability.

[Pozner] Gentlemen, with time running out, but nevertheless I would like you to look at another problem here, and that is experts tend to believe that the issue of verification and a 50% reduction is an extremely complex one because you have cruise missiles, offensive, strategic cruise missiles on board ships and on board planes, and how do you verify compliance? Do you think that this kind of issue can effectively be dealt with?

[Bogdanov] Well, that's my personal view which is based on what I know, on hard facts that we have some devices, technical devices, some technological know-how how to find out do you have a nuclear weapons on the board on the ship with...

[Moloshenko, interrupting] But that's easy enough.

[Bogdanov] Yes.

[Pozner] Because he's talking about radiation. It's radiation.

[Bogdanov] Cruise missiles. Well, radiation, and we suggest, and we have offered our American counterparts to share that technology and let them test that.

[Pozner] Right, so you're saying that basically...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] So, I mean to say basically it's one, that's only one part of the whole very big problem of verification. I would prefer to see another things, you know, though I know that you have now technical means to verify, and I believe that our American counterparts they know, they also know, but what is, what really matters, not all this technological technical business, what matters is goodwill, political will, to do that.

[Pozner] Let me interrupt you here and perhaps put that in slightly different terms. Mikhail Gorbachev in his book "Perestroyka" speaks about the need to deideologize disarmament. Deideologize disarmament.

[Bogdanov] Let me ask our philosophical friend. [laughter] He is really master in that. Do you believe that verification business is an ideological business or what.

[Pozner] Ah, now wait a minute, yeah, well alright, you want to answer that.

[Moloshenko] No, it is not of course, and the problem of verification, I mean the importance of verification, is enormous, and it is extremely important that we achieve this kind of understanding in this respect. And it is not of course an ideological matter, and I would say that it's a major problem of trust, it's a means of keeping trust between the two nations, and it is a means to deideologize and to, well I would say to humanize somehow the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. We were talking last time about enemy images, faces of the enemy. It impossible to have trust between the enemies having images of this kind, and I think that such, you know, this kind of verification helps....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Do you mean to say that we should write off our differences when you say that humanize (?everybody)? What do you mean by that?

[Moloshenko] Well, we should understand these differences, and we should accept the fact that we can have a deal despite any differences, and...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Yes, yes, that I agree.

[Moloshenko] And we can open, you know, we can have real openness in our societies, and even show some military facts and military realities which were stamped most secret, or top secret, if you, it depends again...

[Bogdanov] Or even cosmic.

[Pozner] Yes, but I would like...

[Moloshenko] That again's the difference between English and American.

[Pozner] I would like to get back to what I've just spoken about, and rather to what the general secretary wrote. Is it not your feeling, do you not agree that if we wish to achieve major progress and breakthroughs in the area of disarmament, and towards achieving the goal of a nuclear-free world, that the approach to the issue of disarmament has to be deideologized, because otherwise each side is going to sit on its own ideology and its own approach.

[Bogdanov] My brief answer is yes, yes, and yes.

[Pozner] Alright, how about you?

[Moloshenko] Well, my answer is that there will be differences in ideologies, which is very [word indistinct], but it's absolutely necessary to deideologize our relationship, in a sense to get rid of this artificial, you know, stress on ideology, so I would say propaganda, which we witnessed in the past so often. It's a must, and it should be done.

[Pozner] We have now about 40 seconds left. Do you think, and this of course is not a condition of the summit, it is not a condition, but do you think that there is a possibility that by the time President Reagan visits Moscow, which is supposed to be in the first half of 1988, such a treaty on a 50% cut in strategic offensive nuclear weapons will be possible?

[Bogdanov] My answer is yes.

[Moloshenko] Well, unfortunately, I shall contradict my own pessimistic beliefs, but my answer is yes, also.

[Pozner] Very good, I will...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] What is your answer?

[Pozner] My answer is, I hope so. And the reason I say that is it will demand a great deal of attention, of energy from both sides. You said it will need, it will demand, goodwill. That is true. But it will demand more than that, it will demand a great intelligence, great effort, deep thought. What we're looking at is something that really has never been done before. We're looking at an attempt to turn the tide of what I think could be called the Soviet-American relationship and perhaps the tide of the history of armaments in the world. This is no easy matter. If it doesn't happen by the time of the summit, I will not be too disappointed. The important thing is that it must happen. And now on behalf of "Top Priority" I wish you all good listening.

'International Situation—Questions, Answers'
LD151609 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 15 Jan 88

["International Situation—Questions and Answers" program presented by Konstantin Patsyuk—not further identified, with Tomas Kolesnichenko; Vladimir Bogachev, Anatoliy Doronin, and Nikolay Agayants—participants not further identified]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Patsyuk] On the Soviet-U.S. missiles agreement, some listeners are asking whether we gave away a lot.

[Kolesnichenko] Well, in the first place, we have never and will not forego our right to security. We proceed from the principle of equality, identical security. Yes, if you take, say, the treaty signed in Washington, the figures in it differ: Our side will destroy, say, 826 intermediate-range and 926 shorter-range missiles. The United States will destroy respectively 689 and 170. That is less, is it not? But it is not a matter of numbers. Here you must bear in mind another correlation: For example, primarily there will be none of those Pershings, whose flight time to Moscow was 6 or 7 minutes. For us, those Pershings were strategic weapons, and now they are being scrapped, so to speak. That strengthens our security.

If you take the future treaty on a 50% reduction in strategic arsenals, here, incidentally, the Americans will have to cut a bigger number of warheads. But again, I do not think it is a matter of numbers. It will leave, unfortunately, too many missiles that can blow up the whole world, even if the total arsenals are reduced by 50%. The most important thing is the very fact of a 50% reduction on the obligatory condition of strengthening the ABM Treaty, and not departing from it for the agreed period.

At present many people are asking, for example, when I have occasion to speak to various audiences, what about SDI? We shall be making cuts, they say, but the Americans may now deploy SDI as they want.

[Patsyuk] Incidentally, this quetion is also posed by Ivan Petrovich Zakakey, of Altay Kray.

[Kolesnichenko] It seems to me there are no contradictions here. Indeed, we simply have somewhat changed the emphasis. We said to them: You want to create [sozdavat] the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. You have lots of money—go ahead. Create what you want, without, however, violating the ABM Treaty. The ABM Treaty states precisely that nuclear weapons are not to be put into space. The treaty also enshrines the nonmilitarization of space. So this is extremely important. Of course, now the question is what period can all this cover; that is, maintaining the ABM Treaty which, as you know, is unrestricted in time. For this reason, we say: You go one way, and we shall find another answer, an asymmetrical one, and one which may be, what is more, 100 times cheaper than yours. So I want to stress once again that here the main emphasis is still on not putting weapons into space, a substantial reduction of nuclear arsenals, and, most importantly, a process, a movement, you understand, not toward the brink, not toward nuclear catastrophe, but backwards. This process must be continued. Then everyone will be the winners. That is the only way to open up to humanity the way to a nuclear-free 21st century, to a world without weapons, without wars, which was spoken of in the statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on 15 January 1986. [passage omitted]

Eastern Bloc Foreign Policy, Nicaragua Reviewed
PM191155 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Second Edition p 4

[Boris Orekhov International Review: "The World This Week"]

[Excerpts] "Time is endless movement, without a moment's rest—and it cannot conceivably be otherwise." That remark by L.N. Tolstoy often comes to mind when your turn comes to write the weekly international review and, sitting at the typewriter, you look back in your mind over the kaleidoscope of the past few days' events.

Among the central events on the international calendar for the past 7 days was the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and the leadership of the "International Fund for the Survival and Development of Humanity" at which there was a detailed exchange of opinions on topical problems of world politics and the role of scientists and the public in ensuring the progress and development of the ideas of the new thinking, which is called upon to ensure mankind's survival.

The head of the Soviet Government paid visits to Sweden and Norway during which a number of bilateral documents were signed, and new Soviet initiatives aimed at safeguarding peace in northern Europe were submitted to public scrutiny.

Hand in Hand [subhead]

Year by year, the socialist community countries' role in international affairs and the influence the socialist world has on the course of history increase. The socialist states' contribution to the positive processes now taking place in relations between the two opposing sociopolitical systems is increasing.

Is it not also to the socialist countries' credit that the new political thinking is becoming an increasingly active part of life and moving from the sphere of theory to that of practice?

It is clearly taking root, even if not as quickly as one would like. Increasingly often its shoots are forcing their way through the weeds and thistles of outmoded stereotypes which many people have become accustomed to use as guidance when shaping their conduct in the foreign policy field. The Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles was the first ripe fruit plucked from the tree of new political thinking. The signing of this most important document was a joint success for socialist foreign policy, a fact which was rightly noted during that major event in Soviet-Czechoslovak relations, the recent visit to the Soviet Union by Comrade Milos Jakes, the newly elected general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

The meetings and conversations between the CPSU and CPCZ leaders gave new concrete confirmation to the socialist countries' general foreign policy line. Confidence was expressed that the treaty signed in Washington marked the beginning of the disarmament process and offered the prospect of major reductions in the main strategic arsenals of nuclear weapons. This became possible as a result of a gradual change in the world's psychological climate and changes in the state of people's minds. Among the various factors which played a part here, it is necessary to particularly highlight the contribution of world socialism to awakening mankind's general urge for the improvement and normalization of international relations, a contribution directly linked with the profound changes, restructuring, and renewal—everything which distinguishes the development of socialist society today. Socialism offers an alternative to the outmoded and dangerous concept of nuclear deterrence: the prospect of building a world free of weapons of mass destruction.

Clearly aware of how thorny and difficult the path to a nuclear-free world, a world free of dangers for mankind, will be, the socialist countries and their ruling parties are pursuing a persistent and active foreign policy and bringing that goal closer. Examples of active work of that kind were cited during Comrade M. Jakes' visit to the Soviet Union. It was confirmed that the Warsaw Pact countries advocate an open, constructive, and peace-loving policy. It is well-known, for instance, that Czechoslovakia and the GDR jointly propose the creation of a Central European corridor free of nuclear and chemical weapons. Bulgaria and Romania advocate the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans. Poland proposes additional measures to build confidence in the area where the two military-political alliances meet.

These efforts by the socialist countries cannot go unnoticed and cannot fail to influence the all-European process started in Helsinki by organically merging with it.

"The basis of all wisdom is patience," Plato believed. Many centuries separate us from the age in which the great Greek philosopher lived, but the significance and meaning of his words live on.

Indeed, let us recall what happened 2 years ago, in mid-January 1986. At that time the Soviet Union put forward a program for ridding the world of nuclear weapons, which are capable of destroying all life on earth. Let us recall the world's reaction to those proposals. Let us recall how many people in the world at that time opposed those proposals and how many skeptics there were whose faith in the possibility of realizing the ambitious program outlined in those proposals was weak. Even among those who initially were nearly ecstatic, were there not some whose ecstasy subsequently gave way to skepticism and disillusion? If we are going to be utterly honest with ourselves, let us now ask if even among those of us who expressed our loud and unanimous approval of the disarmament program, were there not some who doubted its chances of success?

The determination and persistence in the pursuit of the set goal and the restraint and patience shown by the socialist countries ultimately caused even those who 2 years ago were fainthearted and skeptical to be glued to their television screens on 8 December last. They were trying to catch every line, every detail of the ceremony taking place in Washington that day, which, before the eyes of millions, became a milestone in mankind's history. The annals of history will also record that factor, the patience of those who made it their aim to steer mankind's ship into peaceful waters, patience without which in our day you cannot pave the road to mankind's bright future.

During Comrade M. Jakes' visit to the USSR, considerable attention was paid to the prospects for bilateral relations between our countries, and that is perfectly natural. The unity of views of the CPSU and the CPCZ on the main problems of socialist building and the main directions of domestic and foreign policy was noted. Both Soviet people and our Czechoslovak friends rightly believe that restructuring and democratization in our countries will promote the further intensification of Soviet-Czechoslovak cooperation. Our peoples are moving hand in hand toward our set goal. [passage omitted]

Smoldering Embers [subhead]

The Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries' mercenary gangs are continuing their dark deeds. Recently a group of Nicaraguan public figures toured areas on the country's Atlantic coast that have been attacked by the contras. It proved that civilians have been casualties of the mercenaries' terrorist actions. That was true of all the towns the group visited—Siuna, Bonanza, and Rosita. More than 40 people, including children and old people, had been murdered by bandits in those places, and more than 50 others had been taken prisoner. The document resulting from the group's visit—the report of the national commission for the protection of human rights—confirms that the contras' criminal actions are a most flagrant breach of human rights and are contrary to the Guatemala accords on the search for a peaceful settlement in Central America.

The Nicaraguan Government has confirmed its readiness to continue the talks on a cease-fire and on achieving a peaceful settlement of the crisis, talks whose latest round was broken off by the Nicaraguan contras on the eve of the new year. The question is: Why did the contras want to do that? As they say on such occasions, look for the one who stands to gain. Those who stand to gain are the ones who are using the U.S. taxpayers' money to arm the Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries.

It is known that an agreement exists between the U.S. Administration and the Congress to the effect that the latter will support the continuation of U.S. aid to the contras if the President vouches that a cease-fire accord with the Sandinistas is impossible. It goes without saying that if the question is put in those terms, the contras will bend over backward to "back up" what the President vouches. That is what they are doing by breaking off talks and continuing the terror campaign against the Nicaraguan civilian population.

It is clear that Washington has no intention of dousing the smoldering embers of the fire which it has lit in Central America and which occasionally flares into flame.

In his New Year's message, the Nicaraguan president says that 1987 was a year of grim trials for the country. Almost 2,500 Nicaraguan civilians—the population of a whole town—died at the hands of America's hirelings. More than 3,600—the size of another town—were wounded. About 800 were driven away by the bandits. During the years of America's undeclared war against Nicaragua, the latter has suffered more than 50,000 casualties with the direct economic damage estimated at $376.7 million.

Human rights... They are being flouted with such cynicism in various parts of the world today, whether it be on the banks of the Biblical Jordan or in Central America. They are being violated by those for whom the true, rather than the apparent, embodiment of human rights remains crude force and a safe filled with government appropriations.

Delors Comments on EEC-CEMA Cooperation

PM151335 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 88 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent S. Filatov dispatch: "Interest In Cooperation"]

[Excerpt] Algiers, 11 Jan—Although the object of the visit to Algeria by J. Delors, chairman of the EC Commission, was to discuss the prospects for cooperation between the "Common Market" and Algeria, the question of EEC relations with CEMA countries was also touched upon at the press conference held following the completion of his talks with local leaders. In this connection J. Delors said:

"At present we are holding talks with the CEMA leadership on mutual recognition. Our organizations are not alike, but this does not prevent us seeking common ground for cooperation. Mutual recognition would enable bilateral agreements to be concluded between individual EEC and CEMA members, which would open up the way for more intensive trade exchange. Such economic ties would conform both with the interests of our states and also with the cause of strengthening peace on the continent and increasing mutual understanding. The EEC is not striving for a monopoly in Europe since the "Common Market" still does not involve all Europe. For instance, Warsaw and Budapest are also European capitals. In short, two partners are needed for a happy marriage. [passage omitted].

AAPSO Presidium Session Opens in Cairo 12 Jan

PM181135 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Session Opens"]

[Text] Cairo, 12 Jan—The 14th Session of the AAPSO Presidium opened in the Egyptian capital today. Delegations from almost 60 states and international and regional organizations are taking part.

The agenda of the session, whose slogan is "For a new strategy and the prospects of Afro-Asian solidarity," included such important questions as the struggle for disarmament, the establishment of a new economic system, the political settlement of conflicts, peace, security, and cooperation.

Addressing the opening session, AAPSO Secretary General Nuri 'Abd al-Razzaq spoke highly of the Soviet-American Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Forum participants expressed the hope that the Soviet Union and the United States will continue their activity toward reducing strategic offensive and conventional armaments, destroying stockpiles of chemical weapons, and banning their production.

Session participants stated their solidarity with the peoples of South Africa engaged in struggle, the Arab people of Palestine who have risen up in struggle against the Israeli occupation, and the countries of Latin America that are staunchly resisting the plots of American imperialism and the forces of reaction. They expressed support for the Afghan Government's efforts aimed at achieving national reconciliation. The need to step up action to halt the fratricidal Iran-Iraq war on the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 598 was stressed.

Muhammad Murad Ghalib, leading Egyptian politician and public figure, was confirmed as acting chairman of AAPSO at the session's first sitting. The session continues its work.

Cairo Session Continues

LD141721 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT 14 Jan 88

[Text] Cairo January 14 TASS—The 14th session of the Presidium of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) continues its deliberations in the Egyptian capital under the slogan "For new strategy and prospects for Afro-Asian solidarity". The session was addressed by representatives of Egypt, Afghanistan, Angola, Algeria, India, Mozambique, Tanzania, the GDR, Hungary, the USSR, World Peace Council, the African National Congress of South Africa, South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and many other countries and organizations.

Speakers highly appraised the results of the Washington summit which had a positive influence on the international situation. They pointed to the need for stepping up the efforts of peace-loving public to achieve new specific steps in disarmament and to strengthen confidence and detente in the world.

The developing countries are facing new tasks in the drive for economic liberation, session delegates pointed out. The real way to resolving these tasks is to establish a new world economic order, to tackle jointly problems of foreign debts of developing countries and elimination of dependence of their economies on transnationals and western countries. The AAPSO should make a weighty contribution to the development of a long-term economic strategy of developing countries.

Delegates heavily panned the aggressive policy of Israel carrying on brutal reprisals against Palestinians on the occupied Arab territories. In this context a serious concern is provoked by Tel Aviv's desire to joint the U.S. "Star Wars" programme and to use nuclear weapons for blackmailing Arab peoples. The session also denounced the racist regime of Pretoria terrorizing the South African native population.

The session continues its work.

Greetings Cabled to Gorbachev

LD152259 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1948 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Cairo, 15 Jan (TASS)—The participants in the 14th session of the Presidium of the Asian and African People's Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) being held in Cairo, have sent a greetings telegram to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

It is profoundly symbolic, states the greetings message, that the present session of the AAPSO Presidium coincides with the second anniversary of the historic program geared to eliminating all nuclear weapons and liberating mankind from the threat of nuclear war by the end of the century which was set forth on 15 January 1986. The participants in the session ardently approve the USSR's untiring efforts in the common struggle by the peoples of the planet for universal peace and security.

The telegram notes that the AAPSO Presidium welcomes the USSR's constructive initiative, which led to the signing of the Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles between the Soviet Union and the United States. This event was the turning point in the cause of nuclear disarmament and the first step along the road to destroying nuclear arsenals.

The participants in the session gave assurances that the AAPSO would make every effort to develop in Asia, Africa, and other developing countries a broad campaign for implementing the constructive peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist and peace-loving states, in order that the peoples of the earth may live in a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

United States & Canada

U.S. Launches Minuteman-1 in System Test

LD200021 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] The United States has launched a Minuteman-1 intercontinental ballistic missile to test its guidance system. It is the first step of this kind carried out by the Pentagon this year. Observers point out that the United States is stepping up its production of strategic weapons despite the Soviet-American agreement to begin drafting a treaty on a 50% reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals.

New U.S. Radar Stations Add Increased Tension

LD200300 Moscow TASS in English 2357 GMT 19 Jan 88

["Tragedy and Its Aftermaths"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—TASS analyst Valeriy Vavilov writes:

Though the tragedy took place 20 years ago, its aftermaths are felt up to this time, and topicality of the task of preventing a nuclear disaster has even grown.

A U.S. strategic bomber B-52 crashed on January 21, 1968. The crew bailed out, and the plane's fragments fell on ice 12 kilometres west of Thule, an American military base in Greenland. The case would have been evidently closed with a brief report about the crash (there is quite a number of them in the world) if not for an extraordinary circumstance: There were four hydrogen bombs aboard the bomber with a capacity of 1.1 megatons each. During the explosion and the fire the nuclear charge (radioactive plutonium-239) was scattered in the vicinity of the plane's crash, and wind sprayed radioactive substances over a vast territory. A total of 1,200 Danes took part in work to do away with aftermaths of the disaster, in search and collection of radioactive debris. As many as 2,000 Americans were at the base. Several of them died.

According to the data of the Danish Institute of Clinical Epidemiology, many have been suffering from skin diseases up to now, incidence of cancer ailments is nearly two times higher among them. Those who were irradiated have children with physiological and mental derangements. However, this is not all: Late last year an object was detected on the sea-bed not far from the place of the crash during a survey. Danish television reported that it could be nothing else but a hydrogen bomb. If this is the case, residents of Greenland and adjacent areas are threatened with unpredictable calamities in future too.

The event showed that the USA ignores Denmark's decision on refusing to deploy nuclear weapons on its territory in peace time. The decision covers, undoubtedly, also Greenland enjoying home rule within the Danish Kingdom.

This old, but not forgotten tragedy stirred recently again the public of Denmark and other Scandinavian countries, reminding them of the danger of the Pentagon's plans. This time the danger of another nature: Last year a new U.S. phased-relay radar was put on alert at the same American military base in Thule. This is a direct violation of the ABM Treaty: It is not permissible to build such stations in Greenland, outside the USA. Its power capacities also surpass those permitted under the ABM Treaty. Other technical characteristics of the station are also in disagreement with the treaty, since they make it suitable to fulfil the tasks of anti-missile defence under the Star Wars programme. The statement by the USSR Foreign Ministry points to the establishment of this station as a direct violation of the treaty.

Both nuclear-capable bombers over the territory of the Danish island and the construction of the new radar station there in violation of the ABM Treaty are elements of the same policy: They show that Washington does not want to take into account aspirations of the Danish people and the will of Greenland's population which proclaimed their island a nuclear-free zone. Disregarding peaceful aspirations of the population, Washington continues using the Danish territory for its military and strategic purposes, including those linked with implementation of the dangerous Star Wars programme.

In this situaton the public of the Nordic countries warmly responded to the proposals of the Soviet Union which put forth a many-sided programme of actions united by a single goal: to achieve a radical decrease in the level of military confrontation in the northern hemisphere by ousting from this region confrontation, mistrust, suspicion and by replacing them with broad peaceful cooperation and interaction. The way to stability, peace and quietude lies in utmost encouragement of the development of friendly mutually advantageous relations of the Nordic countries rather than in building up weapons and constructing new military bases and radar stations, which leads only to increased tension.

Reagan Approves Proposed Space Policy

LD161945 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] Washington January 16 TASS—President Reagan approved a decision on the U.S. national space policy. The newspaper "WASHINGTON POST" referring to "White House sources" reports today that this "ambitious plan is aimed at developing a base on the moon and manned flights to Mars". In its words, Reagan approved such proposals early this month. A request for appropriations for the start of the programme will be included in a bill the administration will submit to Congress in February. According to the journal "AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY", the total sum of appropriations for the new project will top one billion dollars.

"THE WASHINGTON POST" writes that "as part of the proposal, NASA has been instructed to identify potential cooperative projects" with the Soviet Union that could be raised during a new Soviet-American summit.

CIA Plans To Create Internal Front in Nicaragua

LD191406 Moscow TASS in English 1330 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Managua January 19 TASS—The U.S. Central Intelligence Agency has drafted a plan under the code name Oliverio, which aims to create the so-called internal front in Nicaragua involving oppositional forces and counterrevolutionaries.

The Nicaraguan Interior Ministry announced on Monday that representatives of the oppositional political group, the Democratic Coordination Commission, held a secret meeting with contra leaders in Guatemala last week. The two sides discussed the creation of an underground organisation to oust the Sandinista government. The meeting was also attended by two Americans who tried to make the representatives of the legal opposition start counterrevolutionary activities in Nicaragua.

The communique says that the Democratic Coordination Commission rejected CIA proposals and promised to refrain from meeting contras in future.

Reagan Reiterates Support for Nicaraguan Contras

LD201007 Moscow TASS in English 0952 GMT 20 Jan 88

[Text] Washington January 20 TASS—President Reagan Tuesday delivered a speech to Cabinet members and other government officials, in which he presented his administration's service record and defined its goals for the last year in office.

The statement was a kind of dress rehearsal ahead of the President's forthcoming "State of the Union" address to Congress in a week's time, which is traditionally devoted to setting guidelines to White House activities in the following year.

Judging by Reagan's remarks, his administration does not set itself any far-reaching objectives and offers a fairly modest agenda for the next 12 months.

The President attempted to paint a rosy picture of the results of his administration's seven-year tenure and sounded upbeat about future prospects, although many Americans do not share his optimism.

Reagan reiterated his solid support for Nicaraguan contras, stressing that the White House would press Congress for further military aid which, he said, "they need to survive".

Exactly a week from now, the White House will send an official request to Capitol Hill for military aid to the contras, which, according to current estimates, can amount to between 100 and 270 million dollars.

Defending the massive arms buildup under his administration, Reagan said: "Strength, not weakness, is the best way to achieve results with our adversaries."

He urged once again continued "Star Wars" effort.

U.S. Response to Ortega's San Jose Proposal

LD192050 Moscow TASS in English 2007 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—TASS commentator Anatoliy Medvedenko writes:

At a summit meeting in San Jose the other day, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega announced the Sandinists' intention to lift the state of emergency in the country, to start direct talks with contras and expand the amnesty. Heads of Central American states assessed those measures as another important step taken by Nicaragua on the road to the stabilisation of the situation in the region. Managua's new initiatives were received in the same way by Latin American countries, above all those that are included in the Contadora Group and Support Group, which did a lot to create the conditions that make the settlement of the Central American conflict possible.

Those interested in the solution of the regional problem waited for Washington's reaction to that step of Managua. And the U.S. Administration did not make them wait for very long. Appearing in yesterday's programme of the CBS television network U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Elliott Abrams said Nicaragua is not to be trusted and that it is only military pressure by contras that can force Sandinists to concessions. Such was an official response and it would be naive to expect anything else. What is surprising is not the reaction itself but the stubbornness with which Washington tries to drive a wedge between Nicaragua and other countries of Central America, to sow distrust in their relations, to shake the Guatemala agreement that was so difficult to achieve. Elliott Abrams, one of prominent experts of the State Department on Central American problems, is surely aware of the measures that Nicaragua has taken to implement its part of Esquipulas II Agreement. Unlike other countries, Nicaragua is in extremely difficult conditions. It has to oppose the economic blockade imposed by Washington, undeclared war that the United States wages on Nicaraguans. Nevertheless Sandinistas look for the opportunity fo fulfil the Guatemala agreement. Contrary to the impression the United States has to create, the agreement does not mean concessions of Nicaraguans. It means that the Sandinistas are sincerely striving to resolve a conflict situation soas to finally receive an opportunity to build a peaceful life in the interests of the Nicaraguan people, to restore peace in the region.

When Abrams says that Nicaraguans should not be trusted this is the expression of his fear, and quite reasonable, that the implementation of the measures proposed will lead to the normalisation of the situation in the region and Washington will no longer have a pretext to interfere in the affairs of Central America. It is for the same reason that the White House, contrary to the striving for peace shown in San Jose by heads of state of the region, continues pressing on the Congress to get new appropriations for war against Nicaragua.

U.S. Strategy in Nicaragua 'Unchanged'

LD191223 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Washington January 19 (TASS)—High-level meetings took place here on Monday over the results of the meeting of five Central American presidents which has just ended in San Jose and the amounts of additional US military aid to Nicaraguan contras, which the White House is to request from the Congress on January 26. The administration is expected to ask for 50 to 270 million dollars to continue the undeclared war against Nicaragua which the United States is waging through mercenaries.

THE NEW YORK TIMES quoted a high-ranking official of the State Department who insisted on anonymity that the main strategy remained unchanged: to convince the Congress that Ortega should not be trusted and that the contra aid was needed as a safeguard. The same old motives were heard in an interview by Elliott Abrams, assistant secretary for inter-American affairs, to the CBS TV network who kept repeating that military pressure on Nicaragua from contras could force the Sandinist government into making concessions. He tried to play down the importance of a new gesture of good will made by the Nicaraguan Government and to present the measures, declared by it, as a propaganda ploy called upon to influence the results of the forthcoming vote at the congress on aid for the contras.

Further Report

LD181346 Moscow TASS in English 1250 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Washington January 18 TASS—President Reagan intends to ask Congress on January 26 for 270 million dollars in aid to contras, the White House announced officially on Sunday.

The forthcoming move is seen here as an attempt to frustrate the process of a peaceful settlement in Central America, which has received a fresh impulse from a two-day Central American summit meeting in the Costa Rican capital San Jose.

CBS Television said the Reagan administration would have liked it more if the summit has been a failure, but the presidents of the Central American nations had not let the peace process in the region to fizzle out.

The White House plan to foil it by giving a further encouragement to the contras to continue their armed struggle has run into opposition in the House and Senate.

Democratic Senator David Bonior [as received], who attended the San Jose talks as an observer, said Congress would turn down the President's request for more aid to the contras.

He said that it was vital for the peace process to go on and that further U.S. aid to the contras would kill it. The senator added he believed people wanted peace rather than war.

Gorbunov Comments

LD190246 Moscow TASS in English 2219 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—TASS commentator Sergey Gorbunov writes:

Nicaragua's President Daniel Ortega announced at a press conference the Nicaraguan Government's decision to lift the state of emergency introduced in 1982 in connection with the toughening of the U.S. aggression and to open direct talks with contras on ceasefire. The Nicaraguan authorities took these measures in the interests of peace, even though a war unleashed by the United States against the Nicaraguan people with the use of Somoza mercenaries continues in the country.

The new initiatives of the Nicaraguan Government were made public immediately after the meeting of five presidents of Central American countries held in Costa Rica on January 15-16. As is known, that meeting was extremely tense. Following Washington's directives, the delegations of Honduras and Salvador accused Nicaragua of violating provisions of the Guatemalan agreement on peace, related to questions of democracy, protested against demands that the USA end supporting contras mercenary units. And yet the striving of the Central American countries for peace in the region resulted in the fact that the presidents signed a joint document calling for the immediate implementation of those provisions of the Guatemalan agreements that have not been fulfilled to this day. Nicaragua answered that call with concrete steps toward the consolidation of peace.

And what was Washington's reaction to those steps? It follows from a statement of official spokesman for the White House that President Reagan intends to get from the congress new appropriations for the war against Nicaragua despite the fact that the final document of the Costa Rican meeting emphasized again the need for an end to foreign aid to armed groups operating in Central America. According to UPI information, a formal request for aid to armed bands of contras can be sent to the congress as early as on January 26. The White House is expected to ask from 120 to 270 million dollars for this

purpose. THE NEW YORK TIMES notes that representatives of the Reagan administration deliberately play down the importance of new measures of Nicaragua in order to convince the congress to continue the financing of contras.

General Secretary of the Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry Alejandro Bendana said in an interview to the U.S. television network NBC that the granting of new American appropriations to the contras would mean a stab in the backs of the presidents of Central America who assumed the task of fulfilling the plan of peace. A peaceful settlement in Central America will be threatened with frustration, the Nicaraguan diplomat said.

U.S. Observers Respond to 'Peace Offensive'

PM191647 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Jan 88 First Edition p 3

[O. Polyakovskiy and I. Ignayev dispatch under the rubric "The Echo of an Event": "Steady Winds of Change. A Nuclear-Free World by the Year 2000: What the Americans Think"]

[Excerpt] Washington—[Passage omitted] Recently a 3-day international conference, organized by the public organization Committee for Soviet-American Relations, was held in Washington. Taking part in the conference were well-known U.S. "politologists," former and current staffers of U.S. Government departments, and a number of "Soviet affairs specialists" from several West European countries, Japan, and Australia.

In many of the speeches the view was expressed that the West has been caught unawares by the Soviet peace offensive and has to this day been unable to formulate a clear-cut answer to the comprehensive program for ensuring a safe world which was put forward by the Soviet Union. As General William Smith from the Military Analysis Institute noted, under the new leadership the Soviet Union has carried out "very effective work in making arms control part and parcel of the general policy in the sphere of national security." The Soviet strategy in this sphere, he said, is "very well thought out" and forms an integral part of "a broader policy." According to the general, NATO countries have lost ground in formulating an answer to the Soviet initiatives and are lagging even further behind in the elaboration of their own proposals. The success which the USSR has achieved is a "challenge to NATO," the general concluded.

In the view of Professor John Geddis of the University of Ohio, rather than some kind of diversionary maneuvers on the part of the United States and its allies, the response to thise "challenge" must be efforts to overcome the "stereotypes of cold war" in U.S. foreign policy. In the new conditions, he emphasizes, Western leaders must review their approaches to the Soviet Union. Incidentally, the professor admits that this process of reinterpretation may prove "difficult and uncomfortable" for Western political leaders, but it is "important to embark on it."

An important milestone on this path was the December summit in Washington. It stands out above all because, as a result of the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles between the USSR and the United States, it marks the beginning of the practical implementation of the Soviet peace plan. Two countries and with them the whole of mankind have taken the first step on the road of the reduction of nuclear arsenals. John Wallach, a well-known observer of the Hearst newspaper trust who attentively follows Soviet-American relations, told us that "the main impact of the disarmament program put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev 2 years ago is that it has helped to convince the American people, more than the government has done, of the Soviet Union's serious desire for radical and broad reductions of nuclear arsenals."

"The next step along this path," J. Wallach continued, "is a treaty on 50% cuts in strategic offensive forces. I believe that the chances for this are good. It is to be hoped that such an agreement will be ready for signing at the next summit in Moscow in May or early June. If this take place, such an agreement will have good chances to be ratified before the Reagan administration's term of office expires.

"However, I believe that for this to happen it will be necessary for progress at arms control talks to be accompanied by progress on a broader front in our relations.

"For instance, if the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan coincided with President Reagan's visit to Moscow, this would create the right political atmosphere in the United States for the ratification of the treaty on strategic offensive arms before the end of the current year. If these two events—the signing of the treaty on 50% cuts in strategic arsenals and a political settlement in Afghanistan—take place, then this will mark the beginning of a new era in Soviet-American relations," the observer said.

...U.S. meteorologists have dubbed the cold wave from the north "Siberian Express." Meeting the warm air masses coming from the Gulf of Mexico, it has caused abundant snowfalls practically over the whole territory of the United States, not just in Washington. The name was prompted by the fact that the cold wave originated over Siberia and reached America via the Arctic and Canada.

Weather, as is well-known, is characterized by inconstancy. As regards politics, steady warm winds of change are blowing from the Soviet Union to America, causing the ice which has survived from the times of the cold war to melt to the joy of some and the impotent fury of others. In the words of a well-known American song "It don't

take a weatherman to know which way the wind is blowing." And a growing number of the inhabitants of that country are becoming increasingly aware of the source of the changes which are taking place.

Deputy Premier Kamentsev Receives Hammer

PM141252 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jan 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received A. Hammer, chairman of the U.S. company Occidental Petroleum Corporation, on 13 January.

Concrete questions of trade and economic cooperation with Soviet organizations and enterprises were discussed.

Tolkunov Meets With Visiting Congressmen

PM151531 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "A Conversation Has Taken Place"]

[Text] The participants in a Soviet-U.S. meeting at the USSR Supreme Soviet stressed the historic significance of the Washington summit and of the signing of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. A conversation took place here 14 January with a group of U.S. congressmen, who have come to our country at the invitation of the USSR Parliamentary Group.

The visitors—members of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee—were addressed by L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union. He indicated the need for further joint work by the two countries to reduce the level of military danger and reduce strategic, conventional, and other arms. The treaty signed in Washington opens up broad prospects for this. Strict observance of the ABM Treaty and nontransferance of the arms race into space are an important condition for successful practical steps in the disarmament sphere.

The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, T. Lantos, leader of the U.S. group, said, is a historic turning point in relations between the two countries in the disarmament sphere. Other accords in various spheres must follow in the wake of this meeting. The congressman voiced the opinion that the holding of regular meetings between U.S. and USSR leaders must be enshrined in legislation.

The meeting participants stressed the need for joint efforts by the USSR and the United States to settle regional conflicts and resolve global problems. They especially pointed out the important role which parliaments must play in the development of bilateral cooperation. In this connection the Soviet side voiced a proposal to create in the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress corresponding groups to develop regular contacts between the two countries' legislative organs.

USSR Supreme Soviet Deputies G.A. Zhukov and Yu.A. Izrael and other officials took part in the conversation.

Congressman Lantos Comments on USSR Visit

PM191349 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "No Time To Lose"]

[Text] The changes taking place in the Soviet Union are evident and leave a very favorable impression. M.S. Gorbachev's ideas on the openness of Soviet society, economic reform, glasnost, and restructuring are exceptionally productive. This is the opinion of T. Lantos, head of a group of American congressmen who were in Moscow at the invitation of the USSR Parliamentary Group. The guests left our country 17 January.

The meeting between the leaders of the two powers and the signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, he told a TASS correspondent, begin a new stage in American-Soviet relations. We are now impatiently awaiting R. Reagan's visit to Moscow. Congressmen have put forward a proposal to introduce legislation for annual meetings between the two state leaders.

We have to restore our trust in one another. The arms race is simply a consequence of our mutual lack of confidence. The signing of the treaty in Washington is a very important step, an act of faith. I hope that we will also see an accord reached on a 50% reduction in long-range strategic arms. This is perfectly feasible. At the same time, the congressman believes that the Soviet Union must show flexibility on the question of conventional arms. Progress must also be made on chemical weapons. The prospects are very promising, T. Lantos added. It is now very important not to lose momentum.

A world without nuclear weapons is the ideal aim. We would all like to live in such a world. But the guest believes that the only realistic aim in the foreseeable future is to achieve a radical reduction in nuclear arsenals and maintain the necessary minimum of nuclear and conventional arms as a means of deterrence.

Our relations have become more open and our discussions more informal. But there is still one area where mutual understanding has still to be reached—human rights and freedom to emigrate. The population of the Soviet Union is vast, educated, and patriotic. I believe that if the tough restrictions on emigration were lifted very few people would take advantage of it.

The head of the group of American congressmen spoke out in favor of regular contacts between U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet. He described the potential for cooperation between the two countries in various spheres as enormous.

Kamentsev Receives Visiting U.S. Congressmen

PM201019 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 15 January V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, had talks with a group of U.S. congressmen who are in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Parliamentary Group.

A wide range of questions of the state of and prospects for Soviet-U.S. trade and economic relations was touched on, including new forms such as production collaboration and the creation of joint enterprises on USSR territory.

Senator Bradley Interviewed on Treaty

PM191211 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Ivanko interview with Senator W. Bradley under the heading "'I Never Make Predictions'" and the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview"; first paragraph and last three paragraphs are introduction and comment respectively]

[Text] Democratic Senator W. Bradley, a well-known political figure in the United States, is in our country at the invitation of the USSR Parliamentary Group. As U.S. Congress is beginning discussion of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles with the aim of ratifying it, the first question I asked the senator was to find out his opinion on the forthcoming discussion on Capitol Hill. This is what he said:

[Bradley] The Soviet-American treaty will be discussed by three Senate committees, each of which will study different aspects of the agreement. Detailed and, I believe, long hearings lie ahead. Those who drew up the treaty, its opponents, and various experts will be invited to attend. After the hearings, each committee will prepare a report to be distributed to all senators. In addition to this, the committees will vote on the treaty. When the question of ratification is placed before the Senate its members will already be familiar with all the documents. Any senator has the right to propose his own reservations or amendments concerning the treaty. It is too early at present to say how the hearings will end. The Senate has a responsible attitude to its obligations and everything will be done with great care and precision. As a politician I never make predictions, I only prepare for battle.

I agree that arms expenditure must be reduced but if it is to be substantially reduced we must do more than sign the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Our governments must put all their effort into reaching an agreement on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms and also on conventional weapons. We cannot rest content with the treaty we have signed. We have conflicting interests but they must be resolved at the negotiating table. We must move faster.

[Ivanko] Do you intend to vote in favor of ratifying the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles?

[Bradley] I have said all I am going to say on the subject.

[Ivanko] Do you not think that SDI may be one of the main problems standing in the way of 50% reductions?

[Bradley] There are always problems until an agreement is signed. The administration will be holding talks: It has a number of questions to ask, which it intends to discuss with its Soviet partners. When the talks are in progress you can count on an accord being reached.

[Ivanko] What do you think can be done to further improve Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Bradley] As I have already said, the main thing is to decide the issue of reducing strategic and conventional weapons. Apart from this, however, the Americans are very interested to follow the results of developing glasnost in the human rights sphere. Five years ago you could hardly have expected the kind of discussions now being held in your country. Many Americans are taking an interest in events in the Soviet Union. We must learn more about each other, which is why I have come here. It is also important that the Soviet Union should not spring any surprises on the United States in the coming months and years. I am thinking of Afghanistan.

[Ivanko] Do you think Soviet-American cooperation is possible in the sphere of humanitarian problems?

[Bradley] I think that emigration from the Soviet Union must considerably increase. This will be a very positive step and an answer to Americans' concern.

[Ivanko] One of the subjects you discussed with the Soviet leaders and at the NOVYY MIR editorial office was ecology....

[Bradley] We share your concern with the development of ecological problems. I represent the state of New Jersey in the Senate. Some 25 years ago there were no fish in the rivers of New Jersey as they had all died from the polluted water; the atmosphere was also polluted and toxic waste was not being stored correctly. The situation has now improved: Fish have reappeared in the rivers and the air is cleaner. This is the result of legislation approved by Congress. And although it has burdened

firms and the government with considerable outlays, we took this step because we consider people's health more important than the financial expenditure of any organization. There is also great potential for international cooperation in this sphere, but the most important thing is to start in one's own country.

Senator Bradley left the sporting world to join politics (he was a professional basketball player and has even been on the U.S. Olympic team) and is now one of the most popular political figures in the Democratic Party. The presidential election campaign is in full swing in the United States and at present the Democratic positions look weaker than those of the Republicans. This has meant that many observers have begun to talk of the possibility of a new Democratic candidate appearing in the latter stages of the election race. They are suggesting Mario Cuomo, governor of New York State, and Senator Bradley.

The reader will, perhaps, have noticed that the senator avoided direct answers to questions concerning foreign policy. I have come up against this on more than one occasion—most American politicians who come to Moscow refuse to comment on international steps taken by the administration. Is this not because their statements—particularly if critical—could lead to accusations of "sympathy for the Soviet Union"?

One last thing. About these "Soviet surprises." This begs comment, of course, but we will leave the senator's statement to his conscience. The question of who really springs "political surprises" on whom merits a separate discussion.

Comments on Visit

PM201023 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] U.S. Senator W. Bradley left the Soviet Union 14 January. He had been in our country at the invitation of the USSR Parliamentary Group.

"U.S.-Soviet relations at present are tending to develop," W. Bradley told a TASS correspondent before flying out. "Of course, the signing of the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is a tremendous achievement of the two countries. It is necessary to continue the complex work on questions of a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms and to make progress also in resolving the question of reducing conventional arms. I have seen during my trip that the process of glasnost is gathering momentum in the Soviet Union, and I believe that many spheres exist for cooperation between the United States and the USSR today."

Addition to Demichev-Bradley Meeting

The following addition pertains to the TASS item headlined "Meets With Demichev" published on page 15, column one of the 14 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT:

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 January 1988 Second Edition on page 4 under the general heading "Official Reports" supplies the following additional three paragraphs:

end of last paragraph, TASS version reads ...in the conversation.

Both sides stressed the need for energetic efforts to promote further progress in the disarmament cause, in particular as regards reducing strategic offensive and conventional arms. The pace achieved as a result of the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles should be exploited. The senator expressed the view that the prospects for ratifying this treaty in the United States are now relatively favorable. The pre-election situation in the United States was also discussed.

W. Bradley took a lively interest in various aspects of the restructuring in the Soviet Union, noting the imposing nature of the tasks set. He was given detailed explanations, with examples drawn from enterprises in Baku and Tbilisi which the senator visited on his tour of the country.

During the unconstrained conversation, questions of Soviet-U.S. economic cooperation were also touched on.

Science Academy Presidents Hail Accord

PM151201 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jan 88 Second Edition p 1

[Report by N. Larionova: "Cooperation Between the Two Academies"]

[Text] Relations between the United States and our country have not been noted for their stability in the past. It has been a series of ups and downs. There have now been evident changes for the better. Scientific and technical cooperation is developing: On 12 January 1988 the U.S. national Academy of Sciences and the USSR Academy of Sciences signed in Moscow a new 5-year agreement on scientific cooperation.

This agreement was described at a press conference arranged in connection with the signing as a big success resulting from the meeting in December 1987 between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President. This is so, although the talks on the agreement did encounter difficulties. In particular, they came to an agreement on joint programs, symposiums, and conferences, but there was no agreement on lifting the ban on the sale of computers to the Soviet Union.

But the obstacles in the way of scientific and technical cooperation must be surmounted and this will be aided in many respects by the 5-year agreement signed for the USSR Academy of Sciences by its president, G.I. Marchuk, and for the U.S. National Academy of Sciences by Frank Press.

"We have signed a very important agreement," G.I. Marchuk said at the signing ceremony. "It is oriented on a long-term basis. As a result of dogged efforts we have found a basis for mutually interested cooperation. It covers a very broad spectrum: the development of new vaccines, the use of laser and photochemistry, research in the area of the study of the planets, and much else. But I think that the most valuable area is collaboration in the study of global processes—forecasting earthquakes and preserving the ozone layer.

"The AIDS problem will also come under scrutiny. It is a terrible disease and we must act together. Symposiums, conferences, and other measures on the AIDS problem are envisaged within the framework of the joint document."

Frank Press, president of the U.S. national Academy:

"This agreement is particularly opportune in view of the improvement in relations between our countries and in view of the overall improvement in the political climate. We involved all the top leaders of the U.S. national Academy of Sciences and scientists working in your country in the conclusion of this document.

"This agreement will bridge the gap that has existed for many years in scientific cooperation between our countries: Now scientists will be able associate with one another and hold joint symposiums and congresses. And they will return to their laboratories enriched. This document has a special role to perform: It will help demonstrate that scientists must be ambassadors of goodwill."

What has prevented such a broad, long-term agreement on scientific-technical cooperation from being concluded before? Frank Press's reply to me was:

"This agreement is a continuation of an earlier 2-year agreement which has just run out. It was transitional and did not solve all the problems. Interest in this type of cooperation kind of declined. Scientific cooperation has not been particularly productive in the past five years. Now much has changed. The new agreement has given things a jolt."

China

Soviet-Chinese Trade, Cooperation Viewed

Alekseyev on Soviet Aid

OW171305 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] The irrepressible development Soviet-Chinese cooperation in various spheres, which conforms with the objective needs of our two countries at the present stage, is in the fundamental interest of the Soviet and Chinese people and based on the ideals they share.

At its 27th Congress, the CPSU pointed out that Soviet-Chinese cooperation has great potential. This is because socialism is inseparable from peace—an ideal deeply cherished by both countries.

The following serves to illustrate the development of Soviet-Chinese cooperation in recent years:

During the past 5 years, the trade volume between the two countries increased 10 times [shi bei]. According to the 1988 barter protocol signed on 28 December 1987, bilateral trade in 1988 will markedly increase over 1987.

We must also mention one important sphere of Soviet-Chinese economic cooperation: The USSR will assist China in building or rebuilding 24 large industrial enterprises. Enterprises to be rebuilt include the Wuhan Iron and Steel Complex, the Baotou Iron and Steel Complex, the Luoyang Ball Bearing Plant, and the Luoyang Tractor Plant, which were built in the fifties with Soviet assistance. Three new enterprises will be built with Soviet assistance, including a thermopower plant with a total generating capacity of 3.6 million kilowatts.

Soviet people are pleased to know that our two countries are taking identical, or similar, approaches toward a series of international issues. We highly evaluate China's support for the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, primarily the signing of the treaty on destroying intermediate-range missiles.

However, there are still unresolved issues in Soviet-Chinese relations. Thus, the two countries should continue to promote their political dialogue.

Answering questions raised by LIAOWANG, Comrade Gorbachev noted that a Soviet-Chinese summit could become the inevitable development of such a dialogue.

Seen from all angles, the two countries share an objective need. We believe that, as long as both countries press forward, they will find mutually acceptable ways.

Opponents of Rapport Chided

OW182137 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 16 Jan 88

[From "Asian Events" program]

[Text] Dear listeners: Soviet leader Gorbachev's answers to questions raised by a reporter of the Chinese weekly LIAOWANG have attracted worldwide attention. Observers have every reason to believe that the substance and tone of the answers, as well as the fact that a Chinese weekly has interviewed the Soviet leader, are good signs in the development of relations between the

two countries. While some observers are obviously satisfied with these signs, others are not. In this connection, Petrov, an observer of this station, writes:

Such dissatisfaction cannot be regarded as generally positive criticism. The opponents of Soviet-Chinese rapport have become even more insidious in their doings. Verbally, they say nothing except that China should be more careful because the Soviets harbor ulterior motives while putting forward proposals that are pleasing to the ear. They say such thing as: Do not trust Moscow and [words indistinct].

This tactic is nothing new. We heard similar remarks while preparing the historic Soviet-U.S. summit and at meetings to discuss Soviet proposals aimed at consolidating world security. However, when such an argument is used to comment on Soviet-Chinese relations, it has a special meaning because it is closely relevant to socialist countries' mutual relations, which some people have made every effort to undermine in order to split and incapacitate the socialist world so that it cannot take concerted actions. Bourgeois strategists have long been doing all they can to play employ divisive tactics. We remember that when problems appeared in Soviet-Chinese relations, the West used huge quantities of paper and print to advertise that the root causes of our differences could never be removed and that our close cooperation during the fifties was an artificial phenomenon reflecting geopolitical realities. They thus mechanically divided the Soviet and Chinese peoples into two different camps. Today this theory is even more absurd.

However, I cannot help agreeing with a view expressed by those gentlemen who are afraid of the development of Soviet-Chinese relations and progress in the socialist world. They believe that the improvement of Soviet-Chinese relations will seriously limit their freedom of action. I am convinced that the entire human race would easily forget these gentlemen's loss because the world community's concerns are exactly the opposite. It is the hope of people throughout the world that Soviet-Chinese relations will become even more coordinated and harmonious, because this means that Asian security will be further consolidated. The people of the Soviet Union and China will be primary beneficiaries of the enormous potential of these peaceful forces.

Comparison of Report on Deng Anthology

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 16 January 1988 in its Second Edition carries on page 5 an A. Ivanov report on the publication in the Soviet Union of an anthology of works by Chinese ex-Premier Deng Xiaoping. The PRAVDA report, under the headline "Along the Path of Renewal", has been compared with the First Edition version published in the 19 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 33, revealing the following variations:

Paragraph two, penultimate sentence, Second Edition reads ...in socialist modernization.

Speaking at the ceremony, PRC ambassador to the USSR Yu Hongliang pointed out that the development of mutual understanding between the two countries, which will undoubtedly be promoted by the publication of Deng Xiaoping's book, will also serve to strengthen the traditional friendship of the Soviet and Chinese peoples. He expressed profound gratitude to all who prepared the anthology's Russian-language edition.

[Book review begins]... (substituting paragraph for sentence)

Northeast Asia

DPRK Envoy Denies Involvement in Plane Incident

LD191642 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] The charge d'affaires of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the Soviet Union, Chin Si-kun, has said that his country was not involved in the accident with the South Korean airliner last November. He told a news conference at the Embassy in Moscow that South Korean claims about his country's involvement in the crash were designed to distract public attention from the latest proposals of the Democratic People's Republic to hold peace negotiations between North and South.

DPRK Proposal for Joint Meeting Viewed

SK161230 Moscow International Service in Korean 0930 GMT 13 Jan 88

[Commentary by station commentator (Viktorov)]

[Text] DPRK social circles continuously support the DPRK leadership's proposal on the convocation of a joint meeting of political and social activists of the North and South of Korea with the participation of these two countries. Our station commentator (Viktorov) has this to say:

This initiative taken by Pyongyang is one of a number of initiatives it has taken recently to ease tension on the Korean peninsula and to make the principle of dialogue, rather than fierce confrontation, prevail in the relations between the North and the South.

The proposal for a joint meeting, which was put forward in DPRK President Comrade Kim Il-song's New Year's address, offers a good prospect for the peaceful reunification of Korea. The steady effort to explore a settlement of the Korean question has become a characteristic of the DPRK leadership's activities. The Republic holds that the most reasonable way to solve the problem of reunifying the country is to found a nonaligned neutral confederal state on the basis of the North and the South mutually recognizing each other's existence.

When People's Korea makes a proposal for easing tension, its words and actions are consistent. We can recall quite a few important proposals that show the Republic's serious desire to eliminate the stereotyped formula of enmity and distrust. The Government of People's Korea, demonstrating its sincerity, unilaterally reduced its troops by 100,000 men. Judging from a military logic, this type of step should be taken on the part of South Korea, because the experts view that the South Korean military strength is larger than that of North Korea.

The proposals made by People's Korea to initiate military and political talks with South Korea; to turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free peace zone; to replace the Korean Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement; and to adopt the decision to send 150,000 workers from the area close to the Military Demarcation Line to the construction projects of the people's economy all contribute to conducting dialogue, rather than confrontation. The proposal for stopping military exercises contributes to the same objective.

This proposal of Pyongyang's is not an isolated one but it is an important part of the consistent efforts of the socialist countries to strengthen the security of the Korean peninsula and the entire Asian-Pacific region.

Then what is the reaction in South Korea to this proposal? South Korea usually blindly rejects the peace proposals of People's Korea or makes it meaningless by attaching many conditions to it. This attitude is (?backed) by Washington, for the United States is desperately seeking the continuous division of South Korea [as heard] and the stationing of its troops there. This is why Washington continues to rave about the threat of southward invasion.

However, the situation does not stand still. The people in many Asian countries, and in South Korea as well, are responding favorably to the peace proposals of People's Korea. International social circles believe that actively seeking ways to normalize the Korean situation conforms with the interests of the people who desire to live under the condition of peace and cooperation.

The people of the DPRK enthusiastically support the policy of the country's leadership. As Choe Yong-hae, chairman of the League of Socialist Working Youth of Korea Central Committee, said, the new proposal for holding a joint meeting of the political and social activists of the North and the South takes into consideration the interests of the people of broad strata in North and South Korea. The younger generation in People's Korea fully supports the new proposal; and the South Korean political activists, social activists, and student movement look forward to a positive response to this proposal and the promotion of its realization.

Kim Pong-chu, chairman of the General Federation of Trade Unions of Korea Central Committee, stressed that only when delegates of the social circles and delegates of all political forces participate in it, can a good situation be created to ensure peace and security on the Korean peninsula and to realize the reunification of the Korean people. He added that the realization of this proposal will, among other things, be in the interest of the workers and that the working class participating in large-scale socialist construction are aspiring to contribute to the reunification of the country through labor.

No Tae-u Proposes 'Nonparty' Government

LD191800 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Tokyo January 19 TASS—The newly-elect president of South Korea launched a proposal to the leaders of the political opposition to join a "non-party" government which he intends to form after he assumes the post of the head of state on February 25.

This move constitutes a gesture towards political opponents with a view to normalizing the situation which has sharpened following the presidential elections held in the country last December. Leaders of opposition parties claim that No Tae-u won the elections as a result of ballot-rigging and manipulation. One of the reasons behind the proposal made is that No Tae-u, who earned a mere 36.6 per cent of the votes, does not have a "full mandate" of the South Korean population to govern the country.

South Korean parliament went into session, reports from Seoul say. It will consider draft laws relevent to the holding of elections to the National Assembly. The ruling party favours their holding in February so that parliament gets down to work concurrently with the new administration headed by No Tae-u. As for the opposition, it has not rebounded from the December setback and advocates a later term.

Demichev Meets Japanese Art Gallery Executive

PM141029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jan 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Cooperation Essential"]

[Text] P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, met with T. Tashigawa [name as published], vice president of the Japanese gallery Kasama Nichido, in the Kremlin 12 January. She had participated in the opening of a Japanese art exhibition in Moscow.

The need to further develop cultural cooperation was noted. It was stressed that the exchange of exhibitions and the widening of contacts among figures in the arts are of great importance in strengthening friendship between the Soviet and Japanese peoples.

'New Facts' in Japanese Container Spy Case

LD191006 Moscow TASS in English 0925 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Tokyo January 19 (TASS)— By TASS correspondent Vasiliy Golovnin:

New facts have emerged at the year-long court hearing in the case of the container with espionage equipment which was detained by Soviet customs in January 1986 near Moscow en route from Japan to West Germany. It became known in the court that shortly before its departure for the Soviet Union the numbers of the container were forged by unidentified people who tried to use "clean documents" to ensure the passage through Soviet territory of a mobile centre for gathering intelligence under the guise of civilian cargo. This was stated during proceedings by the representatives of the defendant—the transport company Transiberian Container (TSC).

In December 1985 the firm was approached by the Sun Union trading firm and its agent Maruzen Shiowa with a request to deliver a shipment of ornamental oriental vases to Hamburg. The clients themselves loaded their cargo into the container and sealed it. Then it was delivered by sea to the Soviet port of Nakhodka and sent by railway through Siberia to the FRG. In January 1986 Soviet customs officials presented to the president of the company TSC Kenzo Inada the whole array of espionage equipment: a camera that automatically takes pictures, devices to measure the level of radioactivity and the route covered, powerful batteries and the computer to process information.

After paying a large sum in fines to its partners in the USSR as envisaged by the agreement, Kenzo Inada started legal proceedings against the company which had placed its order. The investigation suddenly revealed that the genuine container with the vases was most likely replaced on Japanese territory. The unidentified organisers of this operation obviously hoped that the customs seals and documents would serve as a good front for the spy mission on Soviet territory.

It became known later that the geniune container with the ornamental vases was accidentally discovered in the American port of Baltimore in May 1986. According to the daily YOMIURI, an employee for the Maruzen Shiowa firm who was to see to it that the ornamental vases were loaded, hurriedly left for the USA last April together with his family and is living now on the Hawaiis, refusing to take part in the trial.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Hun Sen Stops in Moscow En Route to Paris

Meets Gusev During Stopover

PM201001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Hun Sen, Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo member, Council of Ministers chairman, and PRK foreign minister, arrived in Moscow 15 January en route for France.

He was met at the airport by V.K. Gusev, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman.

Departs Moscow for Paris

LD171937 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1706 GMT 17 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jan (TASS)—Hun Sen, Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo member, Council of Ministers chairman, People's Republic of Kampuchea foreign minister, today left Moscow for Paris.

Meets Sihanouk in Paris

LD201201 Moscow TASS in English 1151 GMT 20 Jan 88

[Text] Paris January 20 TASS—The second round of talks between Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers and foreign minister of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk began in a Paris suburb today.

The meeting, to be held behind closed doors, will focus on ways to reach a political settlement of the situation related to Kampuchea. The sides are also to discuss basic provisions of the Kampuchean Government's programme of national reconciliation with a view to refusing tension and consolidating security in the region.

Construction Cooperation With Vietnam Expanded

BK140903 Hanoi Domestic Service in Vietnamese 1430 GMT 7 Jan 88

[Text] Comrade (Nikobinov), director of the Vladivostok Construction General Department recently told a TASS correspondent that in the days ahead, major construction projects will begin in the Primorea area in the southern part of the USSR's Far East region. These projects will be built by Vietnamese construction specialists and workers. A Vietnamese construction organization will be established in the Soviet Union to supervise the tasks of about 2,100 Vietnamese construction specialists. In the days ahead, Vietnam and the Soviet Union will sign three construction agreements. Vietnamese specialists will take part in construction of a joint livestock-raising farm in (Esurizer) city and other projects of the Soviet Sciences Academy's Far Eastern Region Department.

The Soviet side will provide Vietnamese construction organizations with documents, charts, facilities, and construction materials. The Vietnamese side will rent machines, equipment, transportation facilities, and other essential items for assembly and construction work

from the Soviet Union. Machines and equipment used for these projects will be transferred to Vietnam after completion of the projects as part of the payment for the construction work.

Comrade (Nikobinov) said the new Soviet-Vietnamese construction cooperation will be carried out in accordance with the spirit of a treaty between the Soviet Far Eastern Region Construction Ministry and the Vietnamese Ministry of Building. The treaty will be signed in Hanoi in the near future, together with other construction agreements.

Near East & South Asia

Belyakov Views Mubarak Tour of Arab States

PM201641 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jan 88 Second Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Vladimir Belyakov "Comment": "The Near East: New Realities"]

[Excerpts] Cairo—Egyptian President H. Mubarak has been on a Near East tour. He visited Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Kuwait, Qatar, Bahrain, and other states in the region. In Baghdad the Egyptian president also met with PLO Executive Committee Chairman Y. 'Arafat. [passage omitted]

Naturally, the Iran-Iraq war was the main topic of Mubarak's talks during his trip. During it he repeatedly stated that the security of the Arab states of the Persian Gulf and Egypt is "inseparable." The Egyptian president rejected an Arab press report that there are Egyptian warships in the waters of the Gulf and that in return for sending Egyptian forces to those states, the rich neighbors have promised to pay Egypt's military debt to the United States, which is nearly $5 billion. However, as many observers note, Egypt is prepared to give the Persian Gulf states military aid by sending advisers and supplying weapons.

The other very important item on the agenda was the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Arab summit conference in Amman, which was not attended by an Egyptian representative, came out in favor of the speediest convening of an international peace conference on the Near East under UN auspices, with all interested sides participating. Egypt adopts the same position. As Egyptian officials stated in connection with the president's trip, there was no disagreement among the talks participants on this matter.

It is an interesting fact, though, that Egypt's cooperation is almost exclusively with the so-called "moderate" Arab regimes that have close links with the West. In other words, the process of restoring Egypt's positions in the Arab world is accompanied by a process of consolidation of conservative forces in the region.

President Mubarak's Near East tour is also of interest because it took place on the eve of his trip to Western Europe and the United States. To all appearances, Mubarak will be addressing the Western countries' leaders not only on his own account, but as a representative of the "moderate" states in the Arab world.

Najibullah Addresses Reconciliation Commission

PM201151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Make the Process Irreversible"]

[Text] Kabul, 16 Jan—The capital today was the venue of a jubilee session of the Supreme Extraordinary Commission on National Reconciliation in Afghanistan, which was set up exactly 1 year ago after the PDPA adopted the course aimed at ending the bloody war and creating forms of state management based on coalition. The session was held under the slogan "Peace in your home—peace in Afghanistan."

President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan delivered a report to the commission session.

Exactly 1 year ago, he said, in this very hall our war-weary people's striving for reconciliation and ardent desire for an end to the fratricidal war were heard for the first time. I should like to think that our people will call 15 January a day of peace. That day marks for us the beginning of the implementation of the national reconciliation policy.

In the past year 3,200 villages have switched peacefully to the side of people's power, whereas in the previous 8 years only 6,200 changed sides.

Some 110,000 of our fellow-countrymen returned to their homes from camps in Pakistan and Iran, compared to only 5,000 refugees a year before.

More than 40,000 armed rebels have ended their resistance and signed armistice and cease-fire protocols, and 6,000 of their representatives have entered coalition organs of government. In addition to the rebels, over 150,000 of our fellow-countrymen have opted for peace. During the years of the undeclared war, the number of former rebels who laid their arms did not exceed 12,000. At the intercession of national reconciliation commissions, 19,000 people have been released from prison early.

There are 165 regions and districts, 2 provinces, and 1,150 villages on the territory of the "peace zones," where about 3 million people now live. There was nothing like this 1 year ago.

One of the most graphic signs of the reconciliation is intensive development of the national economy, increased activity of private businessmen and manufacturers, improvement of the agrarian and water laws, encouragement of handicrafts and cottage industries, and development of the market system.

In the past year in Afghanistan, new industrial enterprises have opened and 30 have resumed work, primarily in the private and mixed sectors. The volume of industrial production increased by 3.7%, and 138,000 tonnes of wheat were procured.

In the past year, over 700,000 people received wage rises.

Najibullah went on to say: We were the first to propose the beginning of dialogue. The conditions of the ceasefire were observed for exactly 52 days and nights. But the inertia of the 8 years of war proved too great. There was an unprecedented increase in the pressure on our people from Western imperialist circles and regional reaction. The very latest types of arms began appearing in unprecedented quantities in the possession of the ringleaders of those gangs that would not accept reconciliation. There was a redoubling of foreign aid in the form of dollars, marks, and pounds to the leaders of the "gang of seven" and their most immediate henchmen. There were wide-scale acts of terror and subversion. In the space of 9 months, extremists carried out 40 explosions in Kabul and the provinces, committed 12 terrorist acts leaving 95 dead and 140 injured, and kidnapped 8 others.

The enemy's fierce opposition to the policy of reconciliation and the three- to fourfold increase in the shelling of peaceful villages and towns forced the Afghan armed forces to break the ceasefire.

Without waiting for the counterrevolutionary leaders' agreement to the creation of a coalition government, the Afghan leader noted, we began forming a coalition at local level: in villages, districts, regions, and provinces.

But national reconciliation is not a miracle to be wished into existence. It is achieved through persistent and coordinated work by all state organs both at the center and locally.

The path of restructuring is connected with democracy, creation of a coalition and multiparty system, and formation of new organs of power on the basis of general elections to the national council and local organs. A law on elections will be adopted in the near future, and we will mount an election campaign immediately.

On the question of the internationalist soldiers' return home, Najibullah stated that if the Geneva talks are successful, the withdrawal will be carried out in 1988. Even now there are 13 provinces with no Soviet servicemen. However, the opposing side is not joining the coalition in those provinces. The withdrawal could be accelerated if the imperialist powers and the forces of regional reaction end the arms supplies to the irreconcilable extremist section of the Afghan counterrevolution and give guarantees of noninterference in our internal affairs. It is up to the U.S. Administration and the Pakistani leadership to respond.

The question of the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops has been resolved, and it can no longer be cited to justify the opposition leaders' rejection of national dialogue or their attempts to thwart the reconciliation process in Afghanistan.

Foreign policy is inextricably linked with the domestic political aspects of national reconciliation, the speaker pointed out. Throughout the past year, we worked persistently for progress in talks with Pakistan and determinedly sought mutual understanding with the Iranian leadership. The socialist countries gave us great diplomatic support. Our recent visit to India, Vietnam, and Cambodia showed that our people have many friends in South and Southeast Asia. We are not alone in our struggle and the awareness of that gives us strength and confidence. Afghanistan's present government is recognized by 83 of the world's countries. People's power is represented in all the major international organizations.

Our main aim is to make the second year of national reconciliation a decisive year of breakthrough and to make that process irreversible. This will be a year of cohesion and of firm alliance of all progressive and patriotic forces who favor national peace, a year of further building of the new state system based on the strengthening of presidential power, and the coalition and multiparty system, legally enshrined in the constitution of the Republic of Afghanistan.

This will be a year of preparation for the Second PDPA Congress, which will be the most important event in the country's sociopolitical life, and the year of the nationwide celebration of the 10th anniversary of the April Revolution's victory.

Afghanistan Reconciliation Period Reviewed

LD151136 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0330 GMT 15 Jan 88

[From the "120 Minutes" program]

[Text] It is exactly a year today since the coming into force of the Declaration on National Reconciliation in Afghanistan. Our correspondent in Kabul is on the line.

[Correspondent Mikhail Leshchinskiy] On the same January morning, exactly a year ago, we carried a report from this very same Afghan military unit. The first hours of the cease-fire, unilaterally proclaimed by Kabul, had just passed. Tanks and armored equipment had returned to the unit and weapons had been piled up, and one could not help thinking at the time if that day would not become the first day of peace.

However, today the hangars are empty once again, and the personnel at the unit are ensuring the movement of freight columns to the district of Khowst. In this single fact there is a great meaning expressing everything now happening in Afghanistan. On the one side are the indisputable successes of the policy of national reconciliation. More and more antigovernment armed formations are joining it and going over to the side of people's power, the coalition form of government is developing, a new constitution for the country has been adopted, a president has been elected, and refugees are coming back. Good internal and external preconditions are being created for the implementation of an already adopted coordinated political decision on the return home in the course of 12 months of the limited contingent of Soviet troops. Direct links between between republics, oblasts, and towns in our country and provinces in Afghanistan have been established and are being developed.

On the other hand the leaders of the counterrevolution—the so-called Alliance of Seven—who are situated in Pakistan continue to adopt irreconcilable positions. A year ago, when Kabul came out with its peace initiatives, they rejected the very idea of national accord. Their provocative actions have exacerbated the situation in the country. The number of bombardments and the amount of damage and victims among the peace-loving population have increased considerably over the past year. However, in full accordance with the declaration on national reconciliation, the Afghan armed forces are inflicting destructive blows on these armed formations. That's how it was last year in Qandahar, Herat, and Khowst, where large enemy groupings, their base areas and arsenals were wiped out.

Yet the main outcome of the past year is the fact that the desire for peace and an end to the fratricidal war is increasingly becoming an irreversible, nationwide cause.

U.S. 'Information Imperialism' in South Asia

LD171545 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1400 GMT 17 Jan 88

[Text] The expansion of so-called information imperialism has roused strong protest in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. And now a similar protest can be heard coming from the public in Sri Lanka.

On that island, the United States Information Agency is now building a powerful branch of the Voice of America radio station. And although this is explained in general by a natural desire to improve the audibility of this radio station in South Asia, the suspicions and indignation of the Lankians around this issue are well-founded. Moreover, this concerns not only the suspicions of the Lankians.

The matter boils down to the following: The Voice of America, and this is something that even the American press admits, is waging a real propaganda war against those developing countries whose governments pursue a domestic and foreign policy that is not to the liking of Washington. The populations of these countries are hit by a barrage of artfully juggled facts, obviously aimed at destabilizing their course of independence and sovereignty, at discrediting the noncapitalist way of development and cooperation with the world of socialism.

Actually speaking, herein lies the main functions of the United States Information Agency which runs the Voice of America. Scores of the agency's publications, films, videocassettes aimed at fostering an intellectual atmosphere favorable for U.S. political and economic expansion are being disseminated in Asia, and in this offensive, the Voice of America occupies a special place since its subversive programs cannot be blocked by customs inspections, government bans, or measures taken by public organizations on the watch for diversions against national interests and traditions. And this is especially evident in places where the United States is waging its undeclared wars.

One might recall, for instance, how the VOA was used in those days when Washington wanted to punish Libya for its resolute anti-imperialist course. In the early hours of 15 April 1986, when American bombers were in the air to strike Libyan cities, the VOA in 15 programs aimed at generating more panic caused by the sudden night air attacks, to ferment disturbances and chaos in the country.

And the VOA is beaming outright hostile and subversive programs to Syria, Kampuchea, and Afghanistan. It is indicative that even after the Governments of Kampuchea and Afghanistan proclaimed (?the) national reconciliation policy in the countries and demonstrated their desire to achieve a political settlement by undertaking a number of concrete initiatives, the United States Information Agency, instead of folding up its subversive activities, stepping them up on an even greater scope. The VOA started new programs glorifying the violence and brigandage of the counterrevolutionary gangs on Afghan and Kampuchean soil.

Even these examples, and there are many more examples in Asia, seem to be quite enough in order to understand the Lankians who are protesting against the setting up of a VOA branch in their country. All the more so there is one more reason for all the alarm connected with the harm being done to the Asian peoples by information imperialism, and the reason is this: There is a real possibility of the Pentagon using the Lankian branch of the VOA for radio communications with the U.S. naval ships in the Indian Ocean, and even for targetting at military installations in space, being planned in accordance with Washington's Star Wars program. Therefore, information imperialism is not only an attempt to make people live according to someone elses rules and regulations, but it is also a threat to deprive them of the right to live.

Talyzin Receives PDRY Planning Minister
LD162138 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Jan 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Talyzin today received Faraj Ibn Ghanim, minister of planning of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

East Europe

Jakes on Past, Present Role of 'Vanguard Force'
PM200935 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 88 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "M. Jakes' Speech"]

[Text] Prague, 15 Jan—Together with the CPSU and the other fraternal parties Czechoslovak Communists are seeking to ensure the working people's happy life in a socialist society and are struggling to improve socialism and enhance its attractiveness and international influence; their aim is to accelerate social progress and strengthen peace on earth. Milos Jakes, CPCZ Central Committee general secretary, declared this to a Communist Party of Slovakia Central Committee plenum in Bratislava. The further deepening of socialist democracy, he emphasized, is an essential condition for implementing revolutionary social changes. The principle "more democracy, more socialism" exists in the CSSR, just as in the Soviet Union.

Substantive and frank talks were recently held in Moscow, M. Jakes continued, with M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and other Soviet leaders. On behalf of the CPCZ and the Czechoslovak people we voiced full support for the policy of revolutionary changes in society the CPSU and the Soviet people are pursuing. We see it as implementing the revolutionary behests of Great October and V.I. Lenin. We are vitally interested in all-around cooperation with the USSR. The Czechoslovak-Soviet talks in Moscow created good preconditions for deepening it.

On behalf of the CPSU and its leadership Comrade M.S. Gorbachev expressed full support for the CPCZ Central Committee December (1987) Plenum decisions aimed at restructuring and democratization in the CSSR and made a high assessment of Czechoslovakia's contribution to developing the socialist community and of its active participation in the struggle to strengthen world peace and for disarmament.

I wish to emphasize in this connection that the coincidence of our plans, the CPSU's support, and its rich and inspiring experience create a reliable basis and very favorable conditions for the CPCZ's active work in realizing the strategy of accelerating socioeconomic development and all-around social restructuring in the country with the help of democratization. Our task is to take the Czechoslovak economy into the next 5-year period armed with an effective system of economic instruments which will substantially enhance the dynamics of development and stimulate the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the growth of efficiency and quality.

Life itself and practice will undoubtedly make certain amendments to our plans. It is important that every party organ and organization and every Communist take a responsible, disciplined, and creative approach to realizing the decisions adopted. For this it is necessary to face up to the masses, implement an open policy, and ensure broad public control and glasnost. The essence of the Leninist work style consists in live contact with people, and undemocratic administration, excessive paperwork, and red tape are alien to it.

Marching in the vanguard of restructuring means also heading the struggle against negative phenomena in Czechoslovak society—corruption, illegal enrichment, thefts of socialist property, abuses of official position, violations of labor discipline, and drunkenness. Much is said about this, but when it comes down to investigating specific instances, instead of a principled approach, we frequently encounter temporizing, evasion, and the hushing up and suppression of criticism. It must be remembered that no one can be outside the zone of public control and fair criticism.

This year Czechoslovakia will celebrate several anniversaries, including the 20th anniversary of the 1968 events, when the country lived through a profound crisis in the party and society. In this connection it makes sense to recall once again the basic conclusion from our most recent history. This is that the Communist Party was the vanguard force in the working people's struggle for social progress and national independence and that its leading role in society, its loyalty to the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, its close link with the people, and strong friendship and alliance with the USSR and the other fraternal countries are the chief condition for the successful course of socialist building. Any deviation from these principles leads to stagnation in the development of society and could bring about a crisis and jeopardize the foundations of socialism. We were convinced of this from our own experience 2 decades ago, M. Jakes emphasized.

West Europe

More on Shevardnadze's Visit to West Germany

Meets With Leaders
PM201429 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jan 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Talks End"]

[Text] Bonn, 19 Jan—Today E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, met with FRG Chancellor H. Kohl and handed him a personal message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The chancellor described the message as extremely important. In his opinion, it marks the beginning of a new stage in Soviet-West German dialogue and makes it possible to speak of the sides' desire to develop further the two countries' cooperation and interaction in the interests of peace and stability in Europe and throughout the world.

H. Kohl asked E.A. Shevardnadze to tell M.S. Gorbachev that he has acquainted himself with great interest with the propositions set forth by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and that he regards them as valuable and constructive. He intends to study the message carefully and to formulate a thorough response to it.

The chancellor shares M.S. Gorbachev's view that it is necessary and desirable to hold a Soviet-West German summit in the near future. H. Kohl expressed confidence that there would be no great problems in terms of the scheduling and other organizational questions of arranging such a meeting.

E.A. Shevardnadze and H. Kohl had a lengthy talk during which attention was focused on the appraisal of the current world situation, its future development prospects, and the opportunities emerging in this context for deepening collaboration between the two states.

The USSR foreign minister noted that the active position of the FRG Government in support of the speediest ratification by the U.S. Senate of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and the government's calls for decisive progress on disarmament and other issues are duly appreciated in the Soviet Union. In this context H. Kohl reaffirmed that his government regards this treaty as being of historic importance for East-West relations and opening up favorable prospects for the future.

The sides agreed that the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles must form the point of departure for a sweeping and dynamic disarmament process. Coincidence of views was demonstrated in the sides' understanding of the priority of tasks such as the reduction by 50% of the strategic offensive arms with the simultaneous observance of the ABM Treaty, the reduction of conventional arms, and an early ban on chemical weapons.

A final round of talks with H.-D. Genscher was held. The exchange of views on the whole range of questions was concluded. Attention was again focused on various aspects of problems pertaining to European security and the disarmament process and the role which the two countries could play in this sphere. Both sides expressed satisfaction with the work that has been done, which demonstrated interest on the part of the USSR and the FRG in continuing the dialogue.

The ministers heard reports on the results of the consultations of the working groups on bilateral relations, questions of security and disarmament, and legal and humanitarian problems. Their work was raied useful. In particular, note was taken of the coincidence of the sides' positions on questions of banning chemical weapons, and an accord was reached on holding consultations on legal and humanitarian questions. The next such consultations are to be held in Moscow in late 1988. Both sides expressed satisfaction with the new forms of expert-level discussions on problems of interest to the USSR and the FRG.

During the summing up of the results of the talks, it was noted that the current visit and accords that have been achieved are yet another important step forward in developing political contacts between the two countries and adds substance to them. This process can develop successfully on the basis of the sides' adherence to the Moscow Treaty and the four-power agreement on West Berlin. What we are witnessing today, E.A. Shevardnadze said, is the completion of a new page in Soviet-West German relations about which M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke during H.-D. Genscher's visit to the USSR in 1986.

The following bilateral documents were signed: a protocol on consultations, and a protocol on talks on questions connected with the establishment of a USSR Consulate General in Munich and an FRG Consultate General in Kiev. Notes were exchanged on the extension for another 5 years as from 26 December 1988 of the 6 May 1978 agreement on the development and deepening of long-term economic and industrial cooperation between the USSR and the FRG.

The ministers expressed the hope that these documents, which considerably broaden the treaty-and-legal basis of mutual relations, will add to their dynamism and contribute to the strengthening of good-neighborliness, mutually advantageous cooperation, and trust between the two states' peoples.

E.A. Shevardnadze, speaking on behalf of the Soviet Government, invited H.-D. Genscher to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union.

On the same day, E.A. Shevardnadze met with H.-J. Vogel, chairman of the SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany]. A thorough discussion of topical international questions took place.

E.A. Shevardnadze pointed to the SPD's contribution to the achievement of the INF Treaty and expressed gratitude to the party's leadership for its high appraisal of the results of the Soviet-American summit. A coincidence of views between the CPSU and the SPD was noted on the point that it is necessary to utilize the favorable opportunities that have emerged as a result of the Washington

meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan to achieve vigorous progress in the process of reducing strategic and conventional arms and eliminating chemical weapons.

Serious attention was drawn to the danger of the plans for "arms upgrading" in response to elimination of two categories of nuclear weapons. If this is not forestalled, it could lead to another round of the arms race and undermine the positive process which is taking shape. Both parties will resolutely counter these attempts.

Relying on existing experience, the CPSU and the SPD will contribute in every way to further improving Soviet-West German relations. They seek to raise them to a qualitatively new level in keeping with the wishes of the peoples of the USSR and the FRG.

E.A. Shevardnadze had a conversation with J. Ditfurth and P. Kelly, representatives of the "Greens" Party leadership.

Questions pertaining to ending the arms race and environmental and human rights issues were discussed.

The "Greens" Party leaders welcomed the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles as the beginning of a practical movement toward a nuclear-free, nonviolent world. The "Greens" Party regards the treaty as a success of the policy of new thinking and favors its early ratification.

The party leaders were told that people in the Soviet Union are well aware of the role the "Greens" are playing in the campaign to end the arms race, protect the environment, and shape public opinion on topical questions of the present time, both in the FRG itself and beyond its borders.

E.A. Shevardnadze met with L. Spaeth, prime minister of Baden-Wuerttemberg. Questions connected with the latter's upcoming visit to the Soviet Union were discussed.

The Soviet-West German talks evoked a great response in the FRG and were widely covered by the news media.

On the same day E.A. Shevardnadze left Bonn for Madrid.

Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, USSR ambassador to the FRG, was among those who saw him off.

Meets Communist Party Leader

LD191617 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1510 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Bonn, 19 Jan (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, met Herbert Mies, chairman of the German Communist Party.

On behalf of the FRG's Communists, H. Mies expressed total support for Soviet peace initiatives, and stressed the need for a continued joint struggle against the arms race and for a world free of nuclear weapons. He showed great interest in the processes taking place in the USSR, in the restructuring process, and in the implementation of the radical economic reform.

They exchanged opinions on the content of restructuring in the Soviet Union and the CPSU's role in the process. Practical issues of relations between the CPSU and the German Communist Party were examined.

The conversation took place in a friendly and unconstrained atmosphere.

Meets Greens Party Leaders

LD191822 Moscow TASS in English 1717 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Bonn January 15 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR foreign minister, met Jutta Ditfurth and Petra Kelly, representatives of the "Greens" party leadership.

During the talk the sides discussed questions of stopping the arms race, the environmental control and human rights.

The "Greens" party leaders hailed the signing of the Treaty on Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles as the start of practical movement towards a nuclear-free and non-violent world. The "Greens" party regards the treaty as a success of the new thinking policy and stands for its earliest ratification.

The party leaders were told that Soviet people were well aware of the role played by the "Greens" in the campaign for ending the arms race, protecting the environment and moulding public opinion on pressing issues of our times both inside and outside the FRG.

The sides expressed unanimous opinion that the Washington treaty should be followed by new major actions aimed at a drastic cut in strategic offensive weapons (with non-proliferation of the arms race to space), conventional arms and elimination of chemical weapons. They said that they would exert vigorous efforts to prevent a damage to the swing to demilitarization of international relations. [sentence as received] In this context they pointed to the danger of plans of the so-called compensation for nuclear missile systems to be eliminated.

Holds News Conference

PM201215 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 January 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Talks End"]

[Text] Bonn, 19 Jan (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR foreign minister, held a news conference here today on the results of his official visit to the FRG. [This and following variations and additions are reported by Moscow television service in Russian at 2012 GMT on 19 January in a similar report. Here Moscow TV reports: Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze held a press conference in Bonn today in connection with the conclusion of his official visit to the FRG. The USSR foreign minister made the following statement to journalists: [Begin Shevardnadze recording] As you know, we today handed a personal message from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the federal chancellor. It touches upon extremely important questions concerning bilateral relations and those of a general world significance. Now I would like to return to the great political significance of the present stage of the Soviet-West German dialogue. It is happening at the turning point in the general international situation. The FRG Government and people have also contributed to the fact that this turning point has occurred. It has augmented... (deleting seventeen paragraphs, picking up third sentence of paragraph seventeen)] He said:

Ladies and gentlemen, comrades:

I want to thank you for the attention you have paid to our visit and for the interesting and, most importantly, objective and favorable way in which you have covered it.

It seems to me that the press, which is always right, is on this occasion more right than on other occasions in noting the great political importance of the current stage of the political dialogue between the Soviet Union and the FRG.

As you may know, today we handed a personal message from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the federal chancellor. It touches on extremely important questions both for our bilateral relations and those of general international level.

I would like to add that I had a very interesting and substantive conversation with the federal chancellor, the results of which we see as extremel positive.

I would also like to single out the very thorough conversation with FRG President Richard von Weizsaecker.

I thank the president and the federal chancellor for the attention shown from their side.

We had unusually full talks with vice chancellor and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

For the first time, we tried parallel discussions of separate sections of our agenda by groups of experts, which were specially set up for this purpose and which as a result delivered to the ministers verbal reports on the sound and serious work done by them.

We were both satisfied with the results. Such a form is useful in practice. It makes it possible for the ministers to carry out the exchange of views in a more concentrated and efficient way.

We agreed to use this successful experience of the restructuring of our talks in the future, too.

In order to finish talking about the organizational side of the visit, I will say that we had a very full program. We met with the leading figures of all political parties of your country and also with representatives of FRG business.

Each of these meetings was interesting and important from the viewpoint of understanding the policy of the FRG and of the processes underway in it.

We are deeply satisfied with these discussions and very substantive meetings.

Now I would like to return to what I talked about at the very beginning: to the great political significance of the present stage of the Soviet-West German dialogue.

It is happening at a turning point in the general international situation. The FRG Government has also contributed to the occurrence of this turning point. It has augmented the efforts of the Soviet Union, the United States, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and also of other Soviet and U.S. allies.

We value the position, which was taken by the FRG during the working out of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

At the same time, as a result of progress in real nuclear disarmament, the questions of how to conduct matters further now assume a prime importance. Here we would like, and regard it as important, to maintain the closest possible contact with the FRG in its individual capacity, and also as one of NATO's leading members.

We understand that the FRG has its own ideas about ways to strengthen peace and security, about consistency for a given end [tselesoobraznyy] and about the essence of further steps in the area of disarmament. They do not always coincide with ours. We do not see a tragedy in this.

In this context, I will recall a reflection by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee—a reflection of fundamental importance for an

understanding of the Soviet approach—that it is only that security formula which duly takes into account the security interests of each and every side that will turn out to be tenable and stable.

Naturally, it is important for us to know the FRG's views and concerns. Contacts and dialogue will make it possible to bring to light a range of real concerns, indeed, of genuine and real interests. Without this, it is impossible to work out a common language in disarmament affairs, and it will transpire that no mutually acceptable solutions will be found. In this we understandably proceed from the fact that our arguments will likewise be received seriously and that our concerns will be taken into account.

Let us say that one has occasion to hear that in conditions of reducing Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals, the relative importance of other components of armed forces in Europe is growing. In this context, Soviet conventional arms and tactical nuclear arms are pointed out. There is undoubtedly a problem here, but not of the type they are trying to portray. The problem, unfortunately, is that there are some people in Europe who are talking a lot about the need to eliminate the imbalance in conventional weapons, but are in no way in a hurry to tackle it on a practical level, as would be rational.

But surely we too, the Soviet Union and its allies, have well-grounded concern, whereby in conditions of a sharp reduction of the central strategic systems of the USSR and the US, the nuclear capabilities of Britain and France, and the U.S. forward-based weapons in Europe, are seen in a different light. Of course, naval armaments deserve very serious major discussion.

Here there is undoubtedly also a problem, and it can also be treated as a separate issue up to a certain point, as we have done in the past when wanting to reach agreement.

We are prepared to seek a practical compromise solution on a balance of conventional forces and tactical nuclear weapons. But since it is clear that our partners are still not prepared for this, we propose, without delay, to adopt at the Vienna meeting a mandate on the basis of which a start would be made to talks on conventional armaments, including so-called dual purpose means, on the understanding that questions connected with the purely nuclear component of these weapons would be discussed separately.

I emphasize, with all responsibility, that we are in favor of eliminating all imbalances and assymetries on the basis of the strictest monitoring [kontrol] and verification [proverka] and on the basis of exchange of the necessary initial data. First and foremost, what is needed here is openness.

Or take chemical weapons, where, incidentally, the positions of the USSR and the FRG are very close. Scores of countries are doing everything to achieve a ban on chemical weapons and their destruction.

The Soviet Union is saying—and reaffirming this with deeds—that it is prepared for any obligations, and for any variations and procedures of verification [proverka] and monitoring [kontrol]. But one European country, by which I mean France, is saying: Yes, let us ban chemical weapons, but so that it still has the right afterwards to manufacture chemical weapons to ensure a "reserve of security".[Moscow TV reports: ...to ensure a so-called reserve of security...] Another power, one has in mind the United States, while fervently calling for a ban on chemical weapons, calmly starts manufacturing new, dangerous types of them.

The Geneva talks on a worldwide chemical weapons ban occupied an important place in our conversations with Foreign Minister Genscher and also during the course of discussions within the framework of the working group on disarmament.[Moscow TV reports:

Mr Genscher and I are firmly convinced—and the FRG chancellor also shares our opinion on this—that very realistic chances, realistic prospects, exist for the conclusion of a convention banning chemical weapons in the very near future... (adding paragraph and deleting next five paragraphs)]

We have agreed that it is necessary to make every effort to complete the talks on this problem in the nearest possible future, in order to strengthen security of all states through destroying, throughout the world, this most inhumane type of arms. We also want to prevent, through banning chemical weapons, a steady increase in the number of countries which possess these arms.

H.D. Genscher and I were unanimous that the progress recently attained in this field has brought the attainment of chemical weapons ban so much closer that there should be no going back. Both of us share the view that the convention on banning chemical weapons requires strict verification procedures that should be worked out once and for all. Both sides will actively facilitate this. A convention on banning chemical weapons ought to guarantee, as soon as it comes into force, that chemical weapons will not be developed or manufactured.

We are united in thinking that openness [otkrytost] represents an effective means in assisting the speediest possible conclusion of the convention. Therefore, corresponding further steps on strengthening trust in this area must be taken.

The remaining unresolved issues on the path toward banning chemical weapons have to be resolved without delay. During our exchange of views, Minister H.-D. Genscher and I were united in condemning any violations of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

Or take the talks about the "pause" in the cause of nuclear disarmament. Why is it needed? Apparently in order to organize the so-called compensatory increase in armaments in Europe.

This is a very dangerous policy, which will if, it is implemented, overturn all that has been achieved in the sphere of nuclear disarmament and will throw us all far back. [Moscow TV adds here: ...very dangerous policy, a very dangerous tendency, which will if...] This must not be permitted.

Evidently it is time for the world public to show specific interest as to why "fatigue" has set in with certain governments and why they need all these "pauses."

There is no denying that in some areas things are moving quickly, and there is a need to move up other elements. But in this case the situation is different because they want to come to a halt on all directions without exception and not to do anything anywhere. [Moscow TV adds here: ...and there is undoubtedly a need to move...]

I wish to note with satisfaction that the FRG leadership and the country's politicians for the most part favor preserving the momentum in disarmament questions.[Moscow TV adds here: ...the country's politicians—at least those I have met and talked with—for the most...] Our views on priorities do not coincide on all counts, but there is a firm understanding and agreement that it is necessary to go forward without slowing down the pace.

During our conversations here, we have encountered very great interest in what is now taking place in the USSR. This interest is perfectly justified and natural. We fully understand the position of those politicians who wish to take a closer look and to convince themselves of the direction in which development is proceeding in our country and how it will affect the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

We welcome such interest and such an approach. We would also like to say with all firmness that the process of restructuring, of implementing radical economic reform, of accelerating social development, of deep democratization and openness is something that is irreversible-.[Moscow TV adds here: ...with all firmness, distinctiveness, and clarity, that the process...] [Same sentence, Moscow TV adds: ...of accelerating social and economic development, of deep...] Only forward movement is possible here, and it is gathering momentum.

The Soviet Union's activities in the international arena convincingly prove that Soviet foreign policy does not stand apart from restructuring; it reveals the essence of the processes taking place in our country.

In all, we regard the Bonn talks as most useful and successful. Of no mean significance is also the fact that we have signed here two important documents that will add to the credit side of our relations. [Moscow TV adds here: ...signed here two very important documents that...] We will of course await Mr Genscher's official return visit to Moscow.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the Federal Government, the municipal authorities, and Bonn inhabitants for their cordiality and hospitality. [Moscow TV adds here: ...In conclusion, once again I would like to sincerely thank the Federal Government, the municipal authorities, and Bonn inhabitants for their cordiality, hospitality, and warmth...]

Subsequently E.A. Shevardnadze replied to many questions from journalists.

Departs FRG for Spain

LD191947 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Bonn January 19 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR foreign minister, ended his official visit to West Germany today and left Bonn for Madrid.

At the airport he was seen off by Hans-Dietrich Genscher, West Germany's vice-chancellor and minister for foreign affairs, and other West German officials.

Outcome of Shevardnadze Visit to FRG Surmised

LD191900 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] As we already reported, the talks between Comrade Shevardnadze and Genscher, federal vice chancellor and FRG foreign minister, ended in Bonn today. Aleksandr Kurilin, our correspondent in Bonn, reports:

[Kurilin] A press conference will take place in Bonn tonight at which the Soviet foreign minister will sum up the first results of the talks with the West German political leadership. However, even now it is possible to say with confidence that the talks played a part in widening the contacts between our countries. New perspectives have been planned for the deepening of cooperation in all spheres: political, economic, and cultural. Thus, for example, a protocol has been signed on regular consultations at foreign minister level, the agreement on economic cooperation has been extended by another 5 years, and Soviet-West German cultural contacts will be developing, too.

However, unresolved problems remain, of course, too—first and foremost in the sphere of disarmament, where the FRG has not yet spoken up, although it can and must do this. Comrade Shevardnadze stressed in his speech yesterday that the Soviet Union is prepared to solve in the shortest possible time the issue regarding the elimination in Europe of tactical nuclear missiles with the range up to 500 km. The discussion in FRG on this topic

is continuing, but no answer to our proposals so far has yet been given to the proposals of the Soviet side concerning the limitation of conventional forces and armaments. There are many unused opportunities in trade and economic relations between the USSR and the FRG. All these issues were touched upon by the foreign minister in the talks with FRG President von Weizsaecker, Chancellor Kohl, Genscher, and other leading West German politicians.

The visit by the USSR foreign minister to the FRG ends today. It has brought undoubted benefit and has become yet another outstanding event in international relations. Comrade Shevardnadze is flying from Bonn to Madrid late tonight.

Borin Assesses Shevardnadze Arms Proposals
LD200024 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 19 Jan 88

[From the "In the News Today" program]

[Text] [Unidentified announcer] In Bonn, the visiting Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze (?said) improved East-West relations have ushered in a new era and called for scrapping short-range nuclear arms. We are in favor of the full elimination of technical nuclear arms in the interests of all Europeans, he told the West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher in a dinner speech yeaterday. Shevardnadze said the superpowers, having agreed on a treaty to ban intermediate-range muclear forces, should now turn to shorter-range nuclear missiles. He said these weapons, with a range of 300 miles, were aimed exclusively at European states near the line of contact between the two alliances. He also called for radical cuts in the conventional forces of both the Warsaw Treaty and NATO and for a global ban on chemical weapons. Now I'll ask Nikolay Borin to comment on this statement:

[Borin] The Soviet foreign minister's statement was made at a time when some NATO officials are trying to rechannel the nuclear arms race in Europe in the aftermath of the INF Treaty. For example, General John Galvin, NATO commander in Europe, recently urged the Western alliance to quadruple the striking range of its battlefield muclear missiles as part of plans to modernize the NATO muclear stockpile in general. What this means is that Europe faces either the prospect of a new arms race (?through) a nuclear and conventional arms modernization, or the prospect of consolidating the Washington summit outcome, especially the INF agreement achieved there in the interests of Europe. We are now hearing possibly the first salvos in this battle for Europe's future.

[Announcer] Some NATO officials keep repeating that nuclear forces form part of NATO's arm control concept.

[Borin] But, really, in other words they are saying that nuclear forces are essential to NATO's flexible response doctrine, which has become their dogma. But I think this is a very important circumstance that should not be passed over in silence. The trouble with NATO's higher eschelons is that their mentality makes them absolutely unprepared for the new realities and new opportunities that have opened up for them. They are set in their way of thinking. If we try to evaluate everyting according to that (?rude) mentality, thinking in terms of a numerical balance of missiles, tanks and guns, in terms of military challenges, and an arms race. [sentence as heard] Paradoxically, many of the top West European politicians have expressed concern over the INF Treaty, which is to rid Europe of the most dangerous and destructive types of weapons, but I think that here we should make allowances for the fact that Western Europe used to follow the strategic line of the United States. The (?air land battle) doctrine was imposed on it by American generals, as was the concept of limited war in Europe and certainly, the cornerstone dogma called the doctrine of flexible response. To expect an immediate awakening from such a deep dream would certainly be naive, though even now we do see the first signs of a new mentality gaining ground in Europe. This in my view holds out promise.

[Announcer] What do you imply by saying a new mentality in Europe?

[Borin] Well, let me use a process of elimination and give you a fresh example of the old mentality. Recently in NEWSWEEK magazine, I read an article written by the former American Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. It was curious to follow the logic of the man, who could think about the European identity, as he put it, only in the sense of a more or less independent European policy in producing arms and armaments. (?Mainly) a man with a rich imagination, he never (?learned to avoid) mentioning even the slightest possibility of Europeans deciding major political issues of European security in Europe. But deep in his heart, Mr Kissinger is frightened of this prospect, and this forced him to write in today's WASHINGTON POST that the story about the Kremlin chief was not balanced by a proper determination to maintain Western defenses. Military (?rhetoric) instead of taking advantage of the INF Treaty to resolve a whole range of European security problems, which could be done by stimulating the (?thoughts) of a broad spectrum of European opinion to work out new guidelines for a more human (?world) enjoying greater mutual trust. [sentence as heard]

[Announcer] Thank you, Nikolay Borin.

FRG Envoy Sees Potential for Broader Soviet Ties
PM200843 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with Andreas Mayer-Landrut, FRG ambassador to the USSR, by B. Orekhov: "'We Have Everything That We Need For Progress'"]

[Text] The PRAVDA editorial board asked Andreas Meyer-Landrut, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the FRG to the Soviet Union, to give us his thoughts on the state of FRG-USSR relations and the prospects for their development. Here is what the ambassador said:

First of all, I should like to say that our mutual interest in each other is growing. We have read in our newspapers a report on the recent session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, which gave a very important assessment of the development of our relations. In July last year, our federal president visited the Soviet Union. In mid-December there was a meeting in Moscow between the FRG minister of economics and the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers at which they discussed our economic relations. Finally, last December F.-J. Strauss, prime minister of Bavaria, visited the Soviet Union. Now E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, is due to visit the FRG.

I believe that high-level meetings of this kind, where long-term political ideas are expressed and which indicate the direction of further development, are of major significance. They give impetus to hundreds, if not thousands, of other contacts. They are an important part of our relations, one which is particularly important for the embassy's work.

Second, there are economic ties. In recent years, unfortunately, they have not developed between our countries as we would have liked. If you take our country's imports from the Soviet Union, 85% or 86% of them are energy and energy sources, such as oil and gas. Because the world market for these products has developed extremely negatively, their prices have fallen considerably. Even with an increase in the amount of this kind of Soviet export, the value has fallen and the volume of purchases by the Soviet side, which usually buys machinery and machine tools from us, has diminished, too. The total volume of our commodity exchange has halved in comparison with the early eighties. This, of course, is a negative factor for us, and we must find new ways and means here to enable our economic relations to progress.

The first thing we should like in this respect is to broaden the range of goods offered us by the Soviet Union. In addition, we are thinking about and working on the new cooperation opportunities which have appeared in recent years. I have joint enterprises in mind, in particular. As far as I am aware, the Soviet Union has now concluded a total of 16 agreements on the creation of such enterprises. Six of them are with firms in the FRG. It is true that so far the enterprises participating in these deals from our side have been comparatively small, but perhaps this is how it should be: After all, we have to gain experience. In any event, this is one opportunity to improve the situation.

The next sphere of our relations is that of culture. It is very important because a familiarity with the culture of another country and another people is an essential basis for creating trust and mutual understanding. That is what we need if you consider the historical upheavals and horrors we have experienced. It is in this particular area, culture, that we can do much to ensure that people understand one another and know that they are now thinking about each other and how they regard one another. Humanitarian ties are of great significance. They include tourism, reciprocal meetings, student and school exchanges, sports, art, exchanges of exhibitions, theater tours, and concerts.

Let us take the scientific sphere. We have good contacts with the USSR Academy of Sciences, the State Committee for Science and Technology, and other Soviet establishments and organizations and scientific institutions. But the potential here is far from exhausted.

This humanitarian area, if I may call it that, should also include the possibility of travel and of exit from the Soviet Union by Soviet citizens of German nationality. Here, too, with the Soviet side's cooperation we have been able to develop our relations well recently.

Now a few words about the difficulties hindering us. The first and main condition and the basis of all relations is mutual trust. The more trust, the better. It is created by contacts in all areas, including tourism. Unfortunately here, too, one can find signs of distrust that would perhaps have been understandable in the past but not today. If a tourist photographs a beautiful landscape and in the background there happens to be, for example, a bridge, afterwards the tourist's film is confiscated and exposed, which is hardly reasonable in our age of satellites capable of taking the most accurate photographs using the most sensitive apparatus. This hardly corresponds to the spirit of the times, in my view.

There are other difficulties, particularly in business cooperation. In the period of restructuring in the Soviet Union, in which our country is showing great positive interest, it has been the case that some questions that come within the competence of one institution have been transferred to other institutions with the result that some of our firms have simply lost track of their Soviet partners, with whom they worked for many years. The conventional and well-established supply channels have been broken. In our work with your foreign trade organizations, we are constantly having to make adjustments and corrections. This is an obstacle.

We must also have a greater opportunity to work with firms directly. Now, when your firms have been empowered to participate directly in the foreign market, it has become more necessary to increase the amount of travel around the country and meetings with people, with representatives of business circles, and with our firms' partners. Here, too, are administrative difficulties that must be eliminated.

Of course, there are things on our side which are to be criticized. I, for example, am no advocate of mixing politics and economics. I do not consider the "policy of embargos" a correct one. It does not meet our current, mutual needs. The same may be said about the policy of restricting the export of materials of a so-called military character. The corresponding Western lists of goods should, I think, be substantially reduced.

Finally, an important question ought to be mentioned, that of international security. The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in Washington is viewed in our country as a major step toward disarmament, security, and stability in Europe. We are fully determined—and I hope that this will be possible within the framework of my activity in Moscow—to take part in new steps concerning chemical and conventional armaments and also to promote further steps in other disarmament spheres where talks are being conducted between the United States and the USSR.

To sum up then, I should like to note once more that the opportunities for broadening FRG-USSR relations are far from exhausted. I believe we have a good basis for that both historically and politically: We have the FRG-USSR treaty of 1970, a whole series of economic agreements, agreements on scientific and technical cooperation, and others. In short, we have everything we need for progress. I am confident that USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze's visit to the FRG will be an extra step in that direction.

Shevardnadze Pays Official Visit to Spain

Visit Previewed

LD200012 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2312 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Madrid, 20 Jan (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, arrived today on an official visit to Spain at the invitation of the Spanish Government.

At the capital's Barajas Airport, the eminent Soviet guest was met by Spanish Foreign Minister Francisco Fernandez-Ordonez, other officials, and representatives from the USSR Embassy.

During the visit Shevardnadze will meet the Spanish head of state, King Juan Carlos I, and Felipe Gonzalez, the head of government. He will hold talks with Foreign Minister Fernandez-Ordonez and also with Felix Pons Irazazabal, president of the Congress of Deputies, and Jose Federico de Carvajal, president of the Senate. The sides will discuss topical international problems—first and foremost disarmament and detente—and matters pertaining to bilateral relations. During the visit the two foreign ministers will sign a long-term program for the development of economic and industrial cooperation between the Soviet Union and Spain, as well as a program of cultural and scientific cooperation for 1988-89.

The Spanish mass media are commenting widely on Shevardnadze's visit, expressing confidence that it will serve the further development of Soviet-Spanish cooperation.

Arrives in Madrid 20 Jan

LD192308 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2258 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Madrid, 20 Jan (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Minister of foreign affairs, arrived in Spain today on an official visit at the invitation of the Spanish Government.

Statement at Airport

LD200118 Moscow TASS in English 0114 GMT 20 Jan 88

[Text] Madrid January 20 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze made the following statement on his arrival at the airport:

We have arrived in Spain at the invitation of the Spanish Government and at the call of long-standing love and respect of the Soviet people for your country.

We have arrived in Spain to confirm again our commitment to the Soviet-Spanish political dialogue which got such a strong impetus as a result of the meetings between top leaders of our states, from the talk between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Mr. Felipe Gonzales, negotiations between Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the head of the Spanish Government.

We have arrived in Spain to discuss with its leaders several important international problems in whose solution we are equally interested.

These are nuclear disarmament, elimination of chemical weapons and reduction in conventional weapons.

This is the European process, the theme (over which we are equally concerned) of a secure, peaceful and cooperating Europe.

This is all-embracing security in all its aspects and manifestations.

I'd live to add to this our bilateral relations having, on the whole, a very positive trend for development and improvement.

The atmosphere in which the visit takes place, is largely conducive to it. Our joy over the conclusion of the Soviet-American Treaty on Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is shared by Spain which sent us a message of approval and support even on the day of signing this treaty. We highly appraise pronouncements by His Majesty the King of Spain about the historic importance of this act which initiated the process of real nuclear disarmament and improvement of East-West relations.

We get down to the negotiations convinced of the fact that Spain makes a big contribution to these trends with its policy and that its bigger role in international affairs is coming in conformity with the historic mission of your country in Europe and all over the world.

I shall have interesting negotiations with my respected colleague Fernandez Ordonez. I am waiting with impatience for meetings with his Majesty Juan Carlos I, chairman of the Spanish Government Felipe Gonzales, other statesmen and politicians of the country.

Stepping on soil of Cervantes, El Greco, Calderon, Goya, Lope de Vega, Lorca, Machado and De Falla for the first time, I cannot but wish peace and happiness to their descendants and heirs—the people of Spain and glorious residents of heroic Madrid.

Ryzhkov Holds News Conference in Norway

PM191611 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 88 Second Edition pp 4-5

[TASS report: "Press Conference in Oslo"; boldface passages as published]

[Text] Oslo, 15 Jan—N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is here on an official visit, has met with journalists covering his stay in Norway. Addressing them, he said:

Since the main official meetings and talks have now been held in Oslo, it is already possible to speak of the results of our visit to Norway.

First of all, I would like to express gratitude to Mrs G. Harlem Brundtland and all our Norwegian hosts and interlocutors for their cordiality and hospitality. The talks with the prime minister and other statesmen of the country, and the conversations with the Storting president and members of his foreign policy committee, were useful and constructive. The basic joint conclusion was that the political dialogue between our countries must be built up and intensified. This is natural, because the USSR and Norway are neighbors, and neighbors must converse constantly with one another. This is demanded by the realities of the modern, interconnected, and contradictory world and by the need to strengthen the present favorable trend in the international situation. The invitation conveyed to Mrs Harlem Brundtland on the Soviet Government's behalf to pay an official visit to our country at a convenient time can serve as the practical guarantee of the dialogue's continuation.

The discussion of **Soviet-Norwegian relations**—and, by agreement with the prime minister, we began the talks with this—took place under the sign of mutual understanding that a new era has begun in our bilateral relations, even though they have a long history and traditions. It began in December 1986, with the arrival of the Norwegian prime minister in our country, her conversations with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and her talks with other Soviet leaders. At our present talks in Oslo, too, as we realized, both sides were tuned to a new wavelength: of good-neighborliness, mutual respect and better mutual understanding, regard for each other's interests and the search for a balance of such interests in the political, economic, or any other sphere. This was the intention with which we approached the present talks, and we draw the conclusion that they were imbued with mutual concern for both the present and the future. Of course, there are difficult, complex questions in Soviet-Norwegian relations, the solution of which demands patience and time. But, in our view, the atmosphere of relations now is such that, even if the solution to some given question is not obvious at this moment, the prospect of resolving it in the future on the basis of cooperation and nonstereotyped approaches can be seen. This is the political dividend from our talks in Oslo.

You are probably awaiting clarification on the question of **the demarcation of sea areas in the Barents Sea**. I must say that we knew of the persistent calls from various Norwegian circles to bring with us an unequivocal version of a final solution to the problem. We brought our proposals and expounded them to the prime minister in detail. We advocated leaving to one side the arguments which are well-known to both sides and on whose basis it has proved impossible to resolve the problem for 17 years now. We proposed taking a broader look at the matter, in the spirit of realism and comprehensive regard for each other's interests.

Just like Norway, we advocate the need for clear and well-defined borders, but the realities are such that we cannot currently arrive at such a mutually acceptable clear-cut border on the shelf and in the sea areas of the Barents Sea. The negotiations are deadlocked. What is the primary cause? It is difficult to name a single cause. The point evidently is that the diverse interests of Norway and the Soviet Union have formed a tight tangle in that region. The simple drawing of a line on a geographic map will not now find a balance of these interests or strengthen security and stability.

This is the chief factor. It suggests the way to advance toward resolving the question. This is the path of overcoming the lack of trust that has taken shape in this region. We endeavored to reflect the general direction of this path in the Murmansk proposals—joint, common

actions [dela] in the spheres of security and peaceful cooperation. After giving comprehensive thought to the question, we in the Soviet leadership decided to propose this path also in bilateral relations, that is, to turn the region of demarcation from a subject of dispute into an object of cooperation and trust.

We see potential for this in a sphere of interest to both you and us—the opening up of the Barents Sea's resources and economic cooperation, including in a region which is the subject of negotiations.

Therefore, during our talks in Oslo, we considered it possible to submit at a political level a proposal **to create a special zone of Soviet-Norwegian** partnership here. There has not been such a thing before, in either your practice or ours.

From our viewpoint, partnership in this zone could include joint activity, say, in the form of a joint enterprise to seek, prospect for, extract, process, and market oil and gas. Such activity would be carried out in a spirit of full equality and mutual advantage on the principles of **the sides' equally shared participation** in capital investments and profits, fifty-fifty. Of course, the zone's configuration is important so that it does not harm the sides' interests and principled positions on the question of demarcation. All questions of joint activity, including the possible participation of third countries and the zone's contours, could be defined during specific talks on the basis of regard for each other's interests.

The Norwegian side is considering this proposal. Well, that is reasonable.

The realization of such a project, which is fundamentally new in terms of the forms and scale of interstate cooperation, would also help to bring **trade and economic relations** between our countries up to a level worthy of neighboring peoples.

The realization of the project for the comprehensive processing of the Kola Peninsula's natural resources could be an addition to or, if you like, an example of this. The scale of this project is so great that, in order to realize it, we propose pooling the capital and the efforts of a number of, or even all, northern countries. We have spoken of this with Finland, Sweden, and now Norway. The reaction has, in principle, been positive, and it would be possible to proceed to specific talks.

We also see "gaps" in such spheres of cooperation, which are undoubtedly advantageous to both peoples, as, for example, the peaceful exploration of space, health care (research into and prevention of cancerous and cardiovascular diseases, the struggle against AIDS, production of medicinal preparations), social security, education, industrial and civil construction, and agriculture. There have been contacts in these spheres in the past, but they have not enjoyed proper development. In our view, the time has come to tackle the matter systematically here, too.

We exchanged opinions on a package of **humanitarian problems**. Time has shown that these questions can be moved from the sphere of polemics into the sphere of practical cooperation. We propose specific forms of cooperation—the convening of an international conference in Moscow on humanitarian problems and bilateral forms of contacts, for example, along parliamentary lines—and we are examining speficic matters.

In short, we wholly advocate translating the potential of our relations into real policies and into actions which accord with the profound, fundamental interests of the Soviet and Norwegian peoples, turning the factor of simple neighborhood into a factor of true good-neighborliness.

This also concerns our countries' cooperation on urgent **international problems**. Since our talks were held in the capital of Norway—a northern country with a direct outlet to the Arctic—we devoted much attention to urgent problems of **security and cooperation in the Arctic and the north** in the context of the program advanced by M.S. Gorbachev in Murmansk and concretized on the Soviet leadership's behalf in talks in Stockholm and Oslo.

Obviously, the essence of our proposals is known from the press reports on those talks and from my speeches in both capitals. Therefore, I will be brief. Our proposals are addressed to all the northern countries together and to the military-political alliances but also to each one of them. As for Norway, in addition to the military-political and economic aspects, we see good opportunities for cooperation in elaborating a comprehensive energy program for the north and in protecting the fragile Arctic natural environment. We had a fruitful discussion about this with Mrs Harlem Brundtland and defined the prospect of joint work.

We have just signed, for example, four new Soviet-Norwegian agreements, each of which organically fits within the contours of the civilian part of the Murmansk program. Life and the demands of the age have brought us to these agreements. Work on realizing them will evidently bring us to new ideas, projects, and joint actions in the context of the Murmansk program.

Of course, we have not reached such broad mutual understanding as we would have liked on all questions of Soviet-Norwegian talks. But this is not the chief thing, particularly if we take account of the differences that exist in the two countries' positions on the political map of the world and the lack of trust that still exists. The chief thing—and this is incontestable—is the positive dynamics of our relations and the fact that both sides are really striving, in the spirit of the new thinking, for a

rapprochement of positions and constructive cooperation. This was definitely manifested in Moscow in December 1986, and there is no doubt about it in Oslo now.

Reasons of a nonevanescent nature lie at the basis of this. The trend toward the normalization of the international situation is increasingly clearly making headway in the world. It is coloring relations between individual countries, including here, in the European north, in warmer tones. The signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has left no one indifferent and has particularly increased the confidence of those who feel responsible for the world's future and for mankind's deliverance from the threat of nuclear destruction. Exactly 2 years ago, this great goal was materialized in the bold, large-scale program for the phased elimination of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons by the end of this century. The past years have strengthened our faith in the viability of this bold scheme.

This is the important basis of the turn for the better, which is also increasingly noticeable in our relations with Norway.

It must also be said that our restructuring is having an appreciable effect on the general political climate in the north. We were able to feel its influence, as a factor of detente and trust, both in Sweden and in Norway.

We prepared for the visits to these countries and for the meetings with their leaders in an equally good mood. For all the differences between them, they are both our neighbors and our partners in the north European region, and we sincerely want to live in peace and concord with them. I believe the results of these visits have helped us to draw substantially closer to this goal.

At the end of the press conference, N.I. Ryzhkov answered numerous questions from journalists.

Norwegian Reactions to Ryzhkov Visit Noted

PM200857 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Second Edition p 4

[Special correspondents Yu. Kuznetsov and V. Peresada report: "Potential for Good-Neighborliness"]

[Text] Oslo, 16 Jan—The weather is unusually mild in Norway these days. The electronic thermometer on Oslo city hall shows 6°. On television it was reported that it is mild virtually throughout northern Europe. The newsreader commented: "Either we are having a vernal winter or a hibernal spring."

"The Norwegians are complaining that the warm weather is preventing them from practicing their favorite sport, skiing, but are voting for the present thaw in the European and world political climate with both hands," says Ove Kopreitan, a leader of the national organization "No to Nuclear Weapons." "We know that our neighbor the Soviet Union is doing a lot in the interests of peace now."

The consolidation of international security and bilateral ties was the main theme during the visit to Norway by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, which ended today. The newspapers are noting that during the visit, several new proposals were submitted on the Soviet leadership's behalf aimed at concretizing certain proposals in M.S. Gorbachev's Murmansk speech.

The press here is commenting keenly on the results of the talks and conversations. Noting that a broad and frank exchange of opinions has taken place, the newspaper ARBEIDERBLADET (the organ of the ruling Labor Party) writes today about the importance of further contacts between the two states' governments. In this connection, the newspaper cites the following comment by Prime Minister Gro Harlem-Brundtland:

"We have just signed some important agreements. This shows that Norway and the Soviet Union can cooperate in many important spheres for the good of our two peoples."

The signing of several Soviet-Norwegian agreements is viewed here as an important outcome of the visit. Those agreements include, for example, accords on cooperation in environmental protection, a sphere which has become particularly topical nowadays, and on scientific and technical cooperation in the Arctic and the north.

"We are confident that these agreements will meet the specific needs of developing our ties," D. Stenseth, general director of the Norwegian Foreign Ministry, said in conversation. "I regard them as concrete instruments which will help to further broaden our relations of good-neighborliness and cooperation."

Even the well-known conservative K. Willoch, who now heads the Storting's foreign policy committee, called M.S. Gorbachev's Murmansk proposals a "new package of interesting initiatives," and that despite reservations which reflect both his political creed and the country's membership of NATO.

At the Norwegian export-import council, they told us plainly that the volume of trade and economic ties between the two countries is very small, asked us for news of the economic restructuring in the USSR, and described the plans and the existing projects for the creation of Soviet-Norwegian joint enterprises. J. Gerhard Heiberg, president of the company Aker Norcem, which builds off-shore oil rigs, said that Norwegian businessmen would like to cooperate with the Soviet Union in many spheres.

Of course, the comments and press materials are not all in the same vein. For example, some commentators are trying to exaggerate such questions as the problem of demarcation in the Barents Sea. However, this problem, which is no simple one, requires a dynamic approach and the search for new and necessarily constructive solutions. The Soviet side demonstrated such an approach when it made the proposal on creating a special Soviet-Norwegian partnership zone in the Barents Sea. The practical solution of the question will undoubtedly require further discussion aimed at achieving a rapprochement of the sides' positions.

The visit now ended reflected the urgent need to invigorate Soviet-Norwegian relations, which have not developed as they should for a long time now. The talks and conversations showed that our countries have considerable potential for strengthening their good-neighborliness and for establishing cooperation in their common interests.

Gorbachev Replies to Italian Friendship Note

LD182233 Moscow TASS in English 2131 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Bassano Del Grappa (Italian region of Veneto) January 18 TASS—A mass rally of Soviet-Italian friendship was held here today. It was attended by prominent political and social figures of Italy, parliamentarians, leaders of the Veneto Regional Council, representatives of the municipal authorities, activists of local public organizations and the USSR ambassador to Italy. In a solemn atmosphere Don Erasmo de Poli, president of the pacifist organization Pagiss [expansion not traced], was presented with a reply by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to a message of city residents, containing a call for proclaiming Bassano del Grappa a nuclear-free zone.

The reply reads as follows:

I received a message of residents of the city of Bassano Del Grappa, signed by 35,000 residents of the city. They were guided, as I understand, by a feeling which is embracing growing numbers of people on our planet: A feeling of their own, personal responsibility for their fate, the fate of their children and the fate of all citizens of the world.

The world in which we live, is still very fragile. The race of lethal weapons is going on. Blood is being shed in many areas, equality and justice have not become a reality for millions of people in dozens of states. But the world is changing before our very eyes. It is changing, above all, due to the fact that millions of people in various countries, as 35,000 residents of Bassano Del Grappa, started actively interfering in big politics, understanding that the time has come to act. To act for the sake of eliminating the fear of a nuclear disaster, for the sake of arresting and then reversing the nuclear race.

Britain's Updating of Tank Forces Assessed

LD141031 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 13 Jan 88

[Text] According to reports from London by the West German DPA news agency, debates have ended in the British capital around the purchase by the British Army of a new tank for the country's armor units in the 1990s. Sergey Sayenko of the British service now considers the results of these debates:

[Sayenko] The British arms manufacturers Vickers received an order for the production of 500 Challenger tanks, whose total cost surpasses 700 million pounds sterling. Contrary to the prognostications of experts, the Leopard II tank produced by the West German Krauss-Maffei concern lost the contract. The new Challenger II tanks will replace the ageing Chieftains.

Currently a consignment of Challenger I tanks is joining Britain's tank force. Each of these machines cost the British taxpayer 1.2 million pounds—a costly acquisition. But is it worth the money paid for it?

At a recent NATO tank shooting competition, these tanks came the last. Specialists have voiced serious doubts as to the possibility of considerably improving the speed and fire power of the updated Challenger model. Nevertheless the British Army will get none other than Challenger II tanks. Why? The reasons for that should be sought in politics. When the Soviet Union and the United States signed a Treaty on Eliminating Medium-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles in Europe last December, many NATO strategists, including high-ranking British military officials, began to claim that the Warsaw Pact countries had superiority over NATO in conventional weapons. These claims were followed by calls for adding to West European forces both nuclear and conventional weapons without delay. Obviously yielding to the threat from the East hysteria, the British military decided to modernize their conventional forces with Challenger II tanks. As for the so-called Soviet threat, in the 70 years of its existence the Soviet Union has never threatened anyone. It only rebuffed aggressions. Besides the West has no reason to harp on the alleged Eastern superiority in conventional arms.

The Soviet Union concedes that there is a disbalance between the Warsaw pact organization and NATO in certain types of conventional weapons. Experts, including Western, those from the London based International Institute for Strategic Studies among them, have declared more than once that on the whole there is parity in terms of both nuclear and conventional weapons between the NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries in Europe. In this light, Western talk as to the need to compensate for the elimination of American medium-range missiles in Europe, is absolutely untenable. NATO officials talk not only about their plans to deploy new types of nuclear weapons in Europe, but also about the developemnt of updated types of conventional weapons.

There is hardly any need for this since according to the London based School of Economics, in the past 5 years alone the NATO countries have considerably improved the quality of their anti-tank weapons and increased the number of tanks themselves in the period in question by 20 percent. Moreover, evading a constructive reply to the Warsaw Pact countries' proposal to reduce conventional weapons at the talks in Vienna, NATO members are beginning to build up their conventional forces. The European NATO members intend to add to their forces already in the current year 250 tanks, 350 anti-tank weapons, 40 batteries with (?the) latest anti-aircraft systems, dozens of Tornado and F-16 planes. These statistics convincingly show who generally stands for reducing conventional arms and who is to blame for the fact that the talks in Vienna have been going on for as many as 14 years.

British Business Delegation Visits Moscow
LD190039 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—Big changes taking place in the Soviet economy open up wide opportunities for the development of business cooperation between Britain and the Soviet Union, it was pointed out here today at a briefing dealing with the visit to Moscow by a delegation of the British business community.

The visit of the delegation consisting of representatives of about 40 firms was organized by the British-Soviet Chamber of Commerce.

According to British data, goods turnover between the Soviet Union and Britain somewhat increased in 1987. In the process, Soviet export to Britain grew by eleven percent and the import of British commodities decreased by nine percent.

At the same time big contracts had been signed on the last days of the past year for the export of products from Britain. Other deals to the tune of several hundred million pounds sterling are now under discussion.

The possibility of joint ventures on the territory of the Soviet Union evokes great interest in Western countries, Soviet participants in the meeting pointed out. More than 300 projects for such cooperation between Soviet and foreign partners are now under discussion. Twenty joint-venture enterprises have already been established, among them two with British firms' participation.

During the visit, the delegation members, many of whom came to the Soviet Union for the first time, will hold talks with Soviet organizations.

British Amity Group on Soviet Disarmament Role
LD171159 Moscow TASS in English 0640 GMT 17 Jan 88

[Text] London January 17 TASS—British-Soviet Friendship Society has issued the following statement for the press:

January 15, 1988 will be the second anniversary of the historic Soviet proposals for ridding the world of all nuclear weapons by the year 2,000, and for other important disarmament measures.

Substantial progress has been made towards this end so far—and obstacles still remain which should be recognized.

One outstanding proposal made two years ago was to eliminate all intermediate-range nuclear missiles of the USSR and the USA in the European zone. The Soviet-USA treaty, signed in Washington on December 8, 1987, pledged both sides to do this over an agreed period, with extensive provisions for verification.

The other outstanding proposal made two years ago was for the completion of a treaty between the USSR and the USA for reducing by one-half the nuclear arms that can reach their respective territories, retaining a maximum of 6,000 warheads on each side. The Soviet-American treaty of December 8 pledged both sides to carry out such a 50 per cent reduction, with elaborate verification by each side of the other's measures.

The Soviet proposals of January 15, 1986, included the offer of "completely eliminating such barbaric weapons of mass destruction as chemical weapons". The treaty of December 8 included the commitment by both sides "to negotiate a verifiable comprehensive and collective international convention for prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons", and proclaimed the "need for intensified negotiations" for this purpose.

The Soviet proposals of January 1986 also called for "agreed reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces" in central Europe, with the USSR and the USA taking the first steps towards such reduction. The treaty of December 8 last called for "early completion" of relevant work being done by experts in Vienna on this issue, so that "substantial negotiations may be started at the earliest possible time".

Thus on four points on which the future life or death of humanity depends, the Soviet proposals of two years ago—widely discounted and even ridiculed when they were made—have taken shape in undertakings to push ahead with them by the two strongest and most influential powers in the world, whose lead cannot be ignored.

There can be no doubt about the reason for this progress. It is the immense swell of public opinion in favour of the commonsense proposals of the USSR, the pressure exerted by ordinary men and women, not only in the USA but also in this country, the United States' principalally.

The British-Soviet Friendship Society urges all sections of the British public to realise nevertheless that the old forces of cynical disbelief in peace and of automatic hostility to the USSR, have by no means been finally defeated, and are still doing what they can to sabotage the results already obtained. Thus in the USA they press for measures to advance the insane scheme for "Star Wars", by putting new weapons into space. This would leave the USA with a new weapon up its sleeve for use against the USSR, after both sides had eliminated half their long-range "strategic" missiles!

Again, the same forces are demanding that elimination of medium-range nuclear arms in europe be "compensated" by increasing sea-borne and submarine-carried nuclear weapons in the seas surrounding Europe!

So far from accepting drastic reduction of conventional weapons and armies in central Europe, the hostile forces in the USA came forward the other day with the demand actually to increase and strengthen the armies with new death-dealing devices!

Everyone in Britain concerned for the survival of the human race, should bring all possible pressure to bear on the British Government to repudiate these tactics by the enemies of prace and disarmament, aimed at reversing the great steps forward taken on December 8, 1987.

Latin America & Caribbean

TASS Links CIA, Contras to Drug Smuggling

LD200036 Moscow TASS in English 2052 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—TASS commentator Sergey Staroselskiy writes:

A proven method of placing one's blame at the wrong door is to shout "Stop thief" and mingle with the crowd, while an innocent person is being seized. The U.S. Administration has been using a similar method for long, accusing Nicaragua of drug-trafficking.

Reports appeared more than once in the press, also American, that Nicaraguan contras, enjoying the patronage of official Washington are engaged in large-scale drug trafficking. Thus, several contras were arrested in 1985 when unloading cocaine from a Colombian plane that landed not far from San Francisco. An investigation was started, but the information about it to the press was suddenly stopped. U.S. journalist Leslie Cockburn recently published a book which traces the connection between arms supplies to contras and contraband of narcotics. Drug traffickers from among contras had their base at a ranch in Colombia owned by former CIA agent John Hull. Leslie Cockburn has the information that Hull had been monthly receiving at least 10,000 dollars from the U.S. National Security Council...

Another book published in the USA, "At War in Nicaragua, the Reagan Doctrine and the Politics of Nostalgia" by E. Bradford Burns, says that the State Department had admitted in the past the contras' involvement in drug trafficking while U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Elliot Abrams confirmed that this matter was raised in his conversations with leaders of the counterrevolution.

This theme was developed further these days. American journalists Dennis Berstine and Vince Belskie reported in a special programme of Boi radio station that the participants in the secret "Iran-Contra" operation of the White House, delivered to the USA tons of marijuana and cocaine. On the basis of their investigation the journalists arrived at the conclusion that secret operations for the support of contras were partially financed from profits from drug trafficking.

Transport aircraft and pilots of proxy companies working for the CIA were used for operations to deliver marijuana and cocaine that were started from bases of contras in Honduras, Costa Rica and Salvador. Nevertheless the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration terminated without any explanations the investigation started against the crews that made flights with cargoes of armaments to contras' bases.

It is characteristic that operations with marijuana and cocaine were staged precisely at the time when President Reagan proclaimed a "crusade" on drug addiction and accused governments of Central American countries, specifically Nicaragua, of "inability" to cut short the activity of drug traffickers.

Central American Settlement Prospects Viewed

PM201621 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Vitaliy Korionov, PRAVDA political observer: "Opposition," under the rubric "Viewpoint"]

[Text] There seems to be every reason to describe the events that have recently developed around the solution to the Central American problem as a decisive phase in the struggle between the forces involved in this process.

A scheduled conference, the third to date, was recently held in San Jose by the presidents of Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. They discussed progress made in implementing the Guatemala agreement they signed in August last year, which has the aim of achieving a political settlement of the crisis in Central America. It must be said that the meeting proceeded in a difficult, contradictory atmosphere. The different views and attitudes of the countries

made themselves felt, serious objections were raised, and even mutual recriminations voiced. The discussion was blunt and tense. Nevertheless, the presidents did manage to make some progress in their search for a peaceful, political settlement of the region's complex problems. They decided to step up implementation of the Guatemala agreement. The Nicaraguan Government's decision to lift the state of emergency in the country and continue talks with the contra leaders made an important contribution to the meeting's success.

The presidential conference was presented with a report prepared by the international commission set up to verify and monitor implementation of the Guatemala agreement, which has visited the five Central American countries. This commission incorporates the foreign ministers of the Contadora Group countries, the Support Group countries, and the five Central American states, as well as UN and OAS representatives.

It should come as no surprise that the Washington administration spared no effort in its attempts to put pressure on some members of the commission, hoping to impose its "viewpoint" on it. The commission's decision that the total, unconditional cessation of U.S. aid to the contras is an indispensable condition of peace in Central America is, therefore, all the more momentous. Despite the demand contained in the Guatemala agreement, the commission report notes, the U.S. Government continues to give the contras military and other aid. As far as Nicaragua is concerned, it has taken real steps to implement the Guatemala agreement. This statement by the commission is particularly important, as Washington and its stooges, by flagrantly distorting the truth, have done their utmost to lay the responsibility for the crisis situation in Central America on Nicaragua.

The majority of Central and South American countries realize that militant North American imperialist circles have to maintain the explosive situation in the Central American region at all costs. The Pentagon needs tension in Central America not only to hold onto its military bridgehead in the region from Guatemala to Panama and maintain its military presence in a number of countries in the northwest part of the continent but also to wield a "deterrent big stick" over the entire continent—particularly since the collapse of the military regimes in Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay. The Contadora Group and the Support Group arose precisely because the Latin Americans are aware of the secret intentions of U.S. imperialism. These intentions would be dealt a serious blow if a peace settlement were achieved in Central America.

That is why on the eve of the Costa Rican meeting of the five presidents, General Powell, newly appointed U.S. national security adviser to the president, made four Central American countries his first stop in order to exert some influence on the leaders of these countries. It was a clear attempt, if not to torpedo the meeting of the five presidents, then to at least erect "obstacles" in the way of its work. Press reports show that the White House envoy did not conceal the fact that U.S. "aid" to the contras would continue regardless of the outcome of the Costa Rica meeting. At the same time, contra leaders have considerably stepped up their attempts to establish something akin to a "united front" with opposition parties in Nicaragua.

However, despite these U.S. maneuvers, the presidents of the five countries managed to make some progress in San Jose. It seems to me that, given this atmosphere, the process of normalizing the situation in the Central American region will gather momentum. This is greatly facilitated by the goodwill attitude on the part of Nicaragua, whose government is introducing more and more new, constructive proposals clearing the way to an agreement. It is also being helped by the increased determination of Latin American patriots to give their continent peace and stability.

Political & Social

Party, Government Resolution on Employment

PM191624 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jan 88 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, and AUCCTU"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, and AUCCTU have adopted a resolution "On Ensuring Efficient Employment of the Population, Improving the Job Placing System, and Strengthening Social Guarantees for Working People."

The resolution stresses that in the Soviet Union the right to work is a very important gain for the people and an indisputable advantage of socialism. Our society's major political and socioeconomic achievements and the establishment of a new way of life for people are indissolubly connected with this gain.

The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, and AUCCTU believe that the manpower resources and production apparatus which exist in the country are still not being utilized efficiently.

The acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the transition to an intensive economy, the radical reform of national economic management, and the improvement of the organizational structures of ministries, departments, associations, and enterprises increase the need to ensure efficient employment of the population and to improve the system for placing the workers thus released in jobs. All working people, the resolution says, should be confident that they are really guaranteed the right to labor. At the same time every worker, specialist, and employee must really work, give his all, value his job, constantly assert himself within the collective with conscientious, highly productive labor, improve his qualifications and professional skills, and value the social guarantees granted by the state.

Under the guidance of the 27th party congress instructions and the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January and June (1987) Plenums, the efficient employment of the population in all sectors of the national economy and regions of the country is to be ensured, the job placing system is to be constantly improved, and social guarantees are to be extended for workers released from enterprises, organizations, and institutions.

Party, soviet, economic, trade union, and Komsomol organs are instructed to implement a range of organizational, social, economic, and legal measures to radically improve the use of manpower resources and create an integrated, statewide system for job placing, retraining, and vocational guidance for the population.

The resolution points out that questions connected with the release, retraining, and job placing of workers should be resolved strictly in line with labor legislation and the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association), on a democratic basis, in an atmosphere of broad glasnost, and with the direct and active participation of the labor collectives. Emphasis is placed on the need to show attentiveness toward released workers, especially women and young people, and on the importance of comprehensive consideration of the interests of different categories of working people.

The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, and AUCCTU instructed leaders of associations, enterprises, organizations, and institutions and party and trade union organizations to ensure the necessary conditions for highly productive labor by all workers, to seek to strengthen order in production, to step up exactingness toward violators of labor discipline, idlers, and drifters, and to establish an atmosphere of intolerance by the collective toward an unconscientious attitude to labor and social duty. The role of the certification of leaders and specialists in assessing the quality of their labor is to be stepped up.

It is deemed expedient, in the course of the implementation of organizational and technical measures, taking into account the certification and rationalization of jobs and the ensuing release of workers, to ensure that jobs are found for them first and foremost within the enterprise, with a view to increasing the production of high quality output necessary to the national economy and ensuring the efficient use of the available production potential on the basis of the introduction of a multishift system for equipment operation, first and foremost unique and costly equipment.

Particular attention is devoted to the full and prompt staffing of newly commissioned facilities with cadres. It is planned to transfer released workers to subunits carrying out work on the basis of the enterprise's own resources in the modernization and retooling of production and the construction of housing and sociocultural facilities.

One of the most important avenues of this work should be the active use of the labor of released workers to increase the production of consumer goods, expand paid services for workers at the enterprise in question and for the population, and develop subsidiary farms. The need is noted to widen opportunities for women with children and people with a limited capacity for work, where they so wish, to work an incomplete working day (or week), and also to work to a flexible schedule or at home.

It is planned to carry out the training and retraining of released workers in the needed professions and specialities on the basis of enterprises' own training courses or

under contracts with vocational and technical schools and higher and secondary specialized educational establishments, as well as with associations, enterprises, and organizations.

It is necessary to step up the role of local soviets, organs for labor and social questions, and trade union councils in ensuring efficient employment of the population. Local soviet ispolkoms must make maximum use of available manpower and carry out the systematic, purposeful redistribution of released workers to enterprises and organizations in the sphere of services to the population, ensuring the accelerated development of that sphere, as well as the fuller satisfaction of the population's needs for housing, paid services, and consumer goods.

In exceptional cases, with a view to better organized job placing for released workers, local soviet ispolkoms may, with the consent of the labor collectives, defer schedules for releasing workers from enterprises, organizations, and institutions.

It is necessary to regard it as an important means of utilizing the labor of workers released from enterprises, organizations, and institutions to form them into cooperatives, as well as to promote individual labor activity.

Ministries and departments, with the participation of trade union organs and bearing in mind the prospects for the sector's development, the modernization and retooling of production, the commissioning of new capacities, the introduction of progressive machinery and technology, and the development of the production infrastructure, are instructed to determine the potential for releasing workers taking into account their professional makeup, and to make provision in good time and on a planned basis for their subsequent placing in jobs. They must give the enterprises practical assistance in ensuring the efficient utilization of these workers in the same sector, and must create the conditions for directing them toward construction sites and enterprises located in regions undergoing new economic development and for reinforcing laggard production units with skilled workers and specialists.

USSR ministries and departments, union republic councils of ministers, local organs for labor and social questions, and Komsomol organs are instructed to give every assistance to the released workers in moving, if they so wish, to jobs in other regions of the country, first and foremost the regions of the north, Siberia, the Far East, and the RSFSR Non-Chernozem Zone, in the form of intrasector transfers, organized recruitment, the social draft, and agricultural resettlement, and to grant these workers the appropriate guarantees and compensations.

Leaders of associations, enterprises, and organizations, local organs, ministries, and departments must create the necessary conditions for retaining incoming workers and ensuring rational utilization of everyone's labor, show concern for creating suitable housing conditions and other social and consumer conditions for them, and help place members of their families in jobs.

In view of the particular significance of systematic, organized work to restructure the structures of union, republican, and other administrative organs located in Moscow City, USSR ministries and departments, the RSFSR Council of Ministers, Moscow Gorispolkom, Moscow Oblispolkom, and party and trade union organs are instructed to elaborate and implement a range of additional measures to place workers released from administrative organs in jobs.

With a view to further improving the selection, placing, and renewal of cadres and ensuring the correct combination of experienced and young workers, it is planned to improve the utilization of the labor of workers and employees who have reached pensionable age at enterprises, organizations, institutions, ministries, departments, and other administrative organs. It is deemed expedient to grant the administration, in conjunction with the trade union committee, the right to maintain labor relations with workers and employees who have reached pensionable age if they work conscientiously and with full commitment, show good results in their labor, and enjoy well earned prestige in the collective, and with other workers who have reached pensionable age and have the necessary length of service for the allocation of a full pension; provision is made for the continuation of labor relations by agreement between the sides through the conclusion (renewal) of a fixed-term labor contract (of up to 2 years), or for the termination of such relations on the initiative of the administration with the consent of the trade union committee.

The resolution points to the need to show concern for finding jobs for released workers so as to reduce to a minimum the possible interruptions in work, temporary loss of earnings, and other complications in connection with changes in labor activity.

The administration of enterprises, organizations, institutions, and trade union committees, in conjunction with councils of labor collectives, are instructed to examine every candidacy for release individually, on the basis of wide glasnost. Workers are to be informed about the opportunities for job placing, retraining, and training in new professions and specialities, and also about the relevant benefits and compensations. It is laid down that a worker is to be informed of possible release no later than 2 months beforehand.

Simultaneously with notification of redundancy in connection with a cut in the numbers of workers or establishment, the administration must offer a worker another job at the same enterprise, organization, or institution. It is envisaged that if a worker is offered a job

at the same enterprise, organization, or institution, he is to be given labor remuneration conditions, benefits, and compensation for the new job in line with existing legislation.

In the event of a lack of work in the relevant profession or speciality, and also in the event that the worker or employee refuses a transfer to another job at the same enterprise, organization, or institution, a worker may, at his own discretion, appeal for assistance to the job placing body, or else find a job independently. At the same time the administration must notify the job placing body of the forthcoming release of a worker, indicating his profession, speciality, qualification, and level of labor remuneration.

The job placing body should offer the worker or employee a job in the same or another locality according to his profession, speciality, and qualifications, or in the absence of such work select another job taking into account individual wishes and social requirements. If necessary a worker may be sent, with his consent, to study a new profession (speciality), and subsequently offered a job.

Workers released from enterprises, organizations, and institutions, where the labor contract is broken in connection with the implementation of measures to cut the number of workers or establishment:

a) a severance allowance of an average month's wage is paid;

b) the average wage is maintained for the period taken to find a job, but for not more than 2 months from the day of dismissal taking into account the payment of a month's severance pay;

c) the average wage is maintained for the period taken to find a job, exceptionally, for the 3d month from the day of dismissal by decision of the job placing body on condition that the worker has appealed to that body in good time (within 2 weeks of dismissal) and a job has not been found.

The payment of a month's severance pay and the maintained average wage takes place on the basis of the former work place. The workers in question are deemed to have an uninterrupted term of service, provided that the interruption in work after dismissal does not exceed 3 months.

In the course of the reorganization and elimination of enterprises, organizations, and institutions, the average wage, taking into account the payment of a month's severance pay, and the continuous term of service, are maintained for released workers for the period taken to find a job, but not more than 3 months.

For workers released from enterprises, organizations, and institutions (including administrative organs) in the above cases, the continuous term of service is maintained for the payment of percentage supplements to wages and single-payment length of service awards, as well as other benefits and payments related to length of service, if they apply at the new place of work. For such workers, where there is a continuous term of service, annual leave is granted irrespective of the length of service at the new place of work.

It is envisaged that where retraining or the improvement of qualifications takes place on a full time basis, released workers and employees retain their average wage, calculated on the basis of the wage at their former place of work, or the difference is made good so as to arrive at the average wage during retraining on a full time basis for the entire period of the training period laid down.

Leaders of enterprises and organizations are granted the right, by agreement with the trade union committee, to grant to workers beginning work in a new or additional profession additional payment to bring them up to the average wage prevailing at their former place of work for a period of 3 months. The additional payment is canceled if the worker violates labor and production discipline.

Expenditure on training and additional payments to bring the worker up to the average wage is borne by the association, enterprise, or organization which has concluded a labor contract with the worker.

Where released workers are transferred to another enterprise, organization, or institution, questions of improving their housing conditions are resolved by the administration and the trade union committee in conjunction with the council of the labor collective at the new place of work. Account is taken of the time the worker has been on the waiting list for improved housing conditions at the former place of work, as well as his total length of service and his attitude to work. Such workers may continue to make use of children's preschool institutions, Pioneer camps, and medical services at the former place of work if they still live in the same city or rayon.

In individual cases, on the initiative of the administration and the trade union committee and with the agreement of the council of the labor collective, released workers may remain on the list for improved housing conditions at their former place of work.

The resolution lays down the procedure for granting benefits and compensations to workers on the apparatus of ministries and departments and at enterprises and associations who are transferred to other posts.

In accordance with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum it is planned to set up a statewide system for job placing, retraining, and vocational guidance for the population, covering all rayons, cities, oblasts, krays, and republics.

To this end it is planned to set up in 1988 in union and autonomous republics, krays, oblasts, and major cities economically accountable centers for job placing, retraining, and vocational guidance for the population, and in other rayons and cities economically accountable job placing bureaus. The detailed list of such centers and bureaus is to be determined by the union republic Councils of Ministers in coordination with the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Questions.

The resolution defines the main tasks in the activity of all components of the statewide system for job placing, retraining, and vocational guidance for the population.

Centers for job placing, retraining, and vocational guidance for the population (job placing bureaus) will operate under the leadership of the local soviets and their labor organs on the principles of economic accountability, according to contracts, and in cooperation with enterprises and organizations. The scale of funds necessary for the operation and development of these centers (bureaus) depends directly on the volume of services offered by enterprises and organizations, and also on the prompt and full satisfaction of their cadre requirements.

Local soviet ispolkoms are granted the right to allocate to centers for job placing, retraining, and vocational guidance for the population (job placing bureaus) some of the funds formed out of deductions from payment for manpower resources contributed by enterprises and organizations to the local budgets in order to finance work associated with ensuring the full and efficient employment of the population and the rational utilization of the region's production forces.

Associations, enterprises, organizations, and institutions must provide centers for job placing, retraining, and vocational guidance for the population (job placing bureaus) with information on free jobs and vacant posts and on all workers released, taken on, and dismissed.

Measures are outlined to develop and introduce automated systems for the management of manpower resources. It is planned to equip the centers for job placing, retraining, and vocational guidance for the population (job placing bureaus) with the necessary computer and calculator equipment to resolve the tasks of predicting, planning, and regulating the population's employment in the regions of the country and for organizing the systematic, prompt redistribution of manpower resources in the national economy.

With a view to providing citizens with up-to-the-minute information, the centers for job placing, retraining, and vocational guidance (job placing bureaus) in the republics, krays, oblasts, and cities must regularly publish bulletins.

Union republic Communist Party central committees, party kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms, union and autonomous councils of ministers, local soviet ispolkoms, USSR ministries and departments, and trade union and Komsomol organs are instructed to show constant concern for ensuring the full and efficient employment of the population, to exercise strict monitoring of compliance with labor legislation and the granting of legal and social guarantees to released workers, and resolutely to cut short any attempts to infringe citizens' rights and legitimate interests.

The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, and AUCCTU expressed confidence that labor collectives and party, soviet, economic, trade union, and Komsomol organs will do everything necessary to ensure that the planned measures are implemented in an organized way with full guarantees of citizens' constitutional rights, and that they help to increase the working people's labor and social activeness in the interest of the further growth of the economy and the people's well-being.

Razumovskiy Visits Uzbekistan 11-13 Jan

PM191015 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jan 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Pursuing Restructuring More Vigorously"]

[Text] G.P. Razumovskiy, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was in the Uzbek SSR 11 through 13 January. He familiarized himself with the activity of the republic party organization in fulfilling the directives of the 27th CPSU Congress, and with how the questions of implementing party policy at the present stage—radical economic reform and the comprehensive democratization of society's life—are being resolved in the republic.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary visited the Samarkand Refrigerator Plant of the "Elektrobytmash" Production Association, and also the "Tashkent Tractor Plant" Production Association named for the 50th anniversary of the USSR, and familiarized himself with the introduction of new equipment and progressive technology, the operation of robotized sectors and lines, and promising developments of new output. Within 2 years the Samarkand plant collective has succeeded in changing from a loss-making enterprise whose output was not in demand to a highly profitable one exporting almost 40% of its output.

In conversations with workers and engineering and technical personnel, the implementation of the radical economic reform, the switch to new methods of economic

management, and the increased role of the labor collectives and their councils in resolving economic and social questions were discussed. Attention was drawn to the necessity of comprehensively stepping up the activity of party organizations at enterprises which have begun working in the new way, and increasing the authority of elected party organs and of each Communist.

G.P. Razumovskiy showed interest in the workers' working and living conditions and the development of the social sphere and housing construction, and he visited the trade and consumer services complex, the cafeteria, relaxation rooms, and the sports hall. Much attention was paid to how the switch to self-capitalization and self-financing will affect the opportunities to significantly improve the life of the working people and will reflect favorably on the work's economic indicators.

In the cities of Tashkent and Samarkand the CPSU Central Committee secretary visited trade and public catering enterprises and the market and familiarized himself with the development of the social sphere. Attention was drawn to the need for the fullest satisfaction of the population's requirements for goods and services.

G.P. Razumovskiy met with the republic's party-soviet aktiv. The meeting discussed the tasks which the republic party organization will have to resolve in preparing for the 19th all-union party conference. It was noted that the reports of the elected party organs which are now taking place have become a severe inspection of the party organizations' activity in implementing the directives of the 27th CPSU Congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums. Attention was drawn to the fact that Uzbekistan's economy is being switched to the rails of technical progress too slowly, a poor job is being made of introducing progressive forms of labor organization, and the process of the renewal of fixed capital is being implemented only slowly. It was pointed out that it is essential to raise the standard of party leadership of the economy and to overcome the gap which still exists between word and deed.

R.N. Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, and V.P. Anishchev, second secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, accompanied G.P. Razumovskiy on his tour of the republic.

Brezhnev's Secretary Jailed for Corruption

PM191601 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Yuriy Feofanov article: "Who Was on the Telephone... Reflections in a Courtroom"]

[Text] This century is not so fearful as last century. News that the "government inspector is coming" causes no one to tremble. In a planned economy inspections are planned too. It is only natural that people should get a bit bothered but there is no need to panic.

However, the commission from Moscow, from the USSR People's Control Committee, came like a bolt from the blue, and in the highly prestigious No 1 Industrial Goods Store in Rostov-na-Donu it revealed scarce goods worth R188,000 stashed away in back rooms. The store director explained in vain that the goods were not intended for speculation or anything like that... The goods had been set aside "on instructions." They were for outfitting delegates, deputies, and other members of the aktiv, including pacesetting milkmaids, machine operators, installation workers, and turners who would be going to rallies, congresses, and conferences.

"You can't send activists to Moscow dressed any old how," the director assured the commission.

The commission stayed silent. But the director, Larisa Nikolayevna Belkina, did not detect the customary understanding in this silence. An impossible situation. Moscow does not believe sob stories, and as for instructions... Moscow itself issues the instructions.

The commission departed, but a panic then began in the city, according to Larisa Nikolayevna. This was in distant 1981, when Budnitskiy was in charge of trade in Rostov-na-Donu: We saw that inveterate thief's trial on television. It was to Budnitskiy that the director of Store No 1 hurried.

"We must find a way, the boss said," Larisa Nikolayevna recalled, "so I began looking. But I never knew, saw, or even heard about that man (she gestured toward the dock). I simply had to keep my job, and I was clutching at straws. I was told: It'll cost 25. So I handed over 25."

"Who told you that figure?"

"There was a sewn goods association next door to my store. Gevorkyan was the general director there and said that she knew someone in the main administration, who in turn knew someone somewhere..."

Gevorkyan was invited to testify. More precisely, it was asked that she be brought in, as she is now serving a sentence. She confirmed everything in broad outline, saying that she had conveyed the money to the "someone in the main administration" not personally but through her deputy, Pogodin. He confirmed everything, saying that he had handed the money to Babayev, deputy chief of the sewn goods main administration. There was no need to summon him—he was already in the courtroom, sitting in the dock. He confirmed that he had received the money. He had said: "Let's arrange a telephone call."

There was indeed a call; two in fact: to the first secretary at the Rostov party obkom, then to the chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee. A person called Brovin, now also sitting in the dock, made the calls. He did not demand anything. He did not give any orders. He simply called and enquired in passing about the "Belkina

case." He enquired in a kindly way about her. This was in 1981. The people and the circumstances have changed. But Belkina directs Store No 1 in Rostov-na-Donu to this day.

That call came from celestial spheres. Brovin was L.I. Brezhnev's secretary.

Brovin was now sitting on the hard bench, as court reporters like to put it. His case was was being heard in open session by the USSR Supreme Court Criminal Cases Collegium chaired by I. Alkhazov (with People's Assessors K. Amosov and A. Zaslavskiy). Gennadiy Danilovich Brovin—53-year-old father of two children and former member of the CPSU—was charged with bribe-taking. Alongside him were his accomplices. These are the official facts of the trial, so to speak.

The trial was routine and sprang no special surprises, although Babayev, who had already been sentenced in another case and who was now charged in this one, did "break down" and confess what he had earlier denied—that he had handed over R20,000

In this sense I even experienced a certain disappointment, because, frankly, I was expecting sensational revelations involving fabulous sums, if not millions of rubles, compromising connections, etc. But there was nothing of this. Brovin's name "emerged" when a much more important case (long since finished) about embezzlement and bribes in the system of the RSFSR Ministry of Light Industry was being heard here in the Supreme Court. The charge involved three episodes: receiving a total of R19,000, plus a fourth episode involving a leather coat. Brovin confessed to everything during the investigation and denied nothing in court. Neither the investigation nor the court found any criminal threads leading "upward." Let the reader believe this—there were none. Brovin was not in collusion with any of the powerful. He was just a "little secretary," one of three duty secretaries. His duties, on which he received verbal instructions, were to bring the evening mail, call oblasts or republics when told to in order to obtain necessary information, and do essential paperwork. But, as a visitor once said, pointing to the government communications line, "I wouldn't mind a telephone like that."

Brovin used this telephone to call I. Bondarenko, first secretary of the party obkom in Rostov-na-Donu, about business. He asked about the prospects for the harvest, how the plans were doing, the oblast's requirements. In between talking about business he said: "By the way, that Belkina case in the oblast... no, I don't know her personally, I've never even seen her, she's supposed to have only a year to go before retiring, no, it's your case, of course, decide what you like... How are things at the 'Rostselmash'?" "We'll see about Belkina," was the reply, and the talk again turned to plans and the harvest.

That was how Brovin described this episode to the court. Witness Bondarenko, the former first secretary, essentially confirmed all this.

"I do not know Brovin personally," he said, "I met him only in the waiting room. But he did call about Belkina. I was told at the time that the breaches in trade procedure were camouflaged by concern for the aktiv. Moreover, they were intending to submit Belkina for an award. Yes, I remember that I called Shkolnikov to ask that the Belkina case be sent to us; we always tried to examine such matters ourselves. I have now forgotten how the discussion of her went. She remained in her post."

Bondarenko did not of course suspect that R6,000 had been given to Brovin on Belkina's behalf. (Incidentally, the rest of the 25,000 taken from her "disappeared" en route.) He did not tell the court how he interpreted Brovin's call, why he immediately rang the USSR People's Conmtrol Committee, or why Belkina, whose dismissal from her post should by rights have been a foregone conclusion, was suddenly effectively forgiven and received just a reprimand. Indeed, the court did not demand all this of the witness. However, I will venture to suggest why a high official like a first secretary forgot about his own high office and party principledness.

He understood perfectly well that there was not and could not be any "instructions" regarding the store director. He knew that the request was in no way binding. He was certain—he could not but be certain of this—that if he acted in a principled way, if he did not respond to the call, there would not and could not be any unpleasant consequences for him. Yet he, figuratively speaking, "stood to attention" at the command and snapped out: "Yessir." The tacit impulse to please both the powerful and those around them was stronger than his own sense of dignity or even the dignity of the organization which he headed. He was aware of his own high position, he could not have been otherwise. However, he keenly sensed the "spirit of the times," the heavy atmosphere of toadying and sucking up to the boss. No, he didn't even have to refuse, he could just politely ignore the call, and there would be no comeback. And yet... Nevertheless... What will they say "there"... And the thought of the law did not even cross the minds of those "standing to attention"!

The times of stagnation bred not only a "shadow economy" but a "shadow administration." I thought about its force and influence as I listened to the testimony of one of its representatives about what I would call its faceless power. It was, after all, the shadow administration that bred the notorious phrase "the feeling is." This phrase flew from the rostrums of sessions and conferences, was pronounced at sessions and in bureaus, and was used when deciding business and cadre matters; when condemning the innocent to suffer and sparing the guilty their punishment. "The feeling is"—the phrase bewitched people, destroyed argument, and erased your

own opinions. Whose "feeling"? This was strictly taboo. Just as in certain tribes you could not, on pain of the most dire punishment, utter the name of the gods, in the spheres of influence of the shadow administration you were not supposed to find out who exactly had expressed the feeling and why. "The feeling is," and that was all-determining.

It saved Larisa Nikolayevna from dismissal. It is clear, however, that it occurred to no one to find out the origin of the "feeling," still less discuss it. They could scarcely have known in Rostov that Brovin had called the then chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, enquired in passing about the "Belkina case," and casually asked whether the matter could not be discussed on the spot and whether it really had to be discussed in the committee. Everything followed the same pattern.

It would obviously be wrong to condemn very harshly those who responded with such alacrity to a call from on high which seemingly committed no one to do anything and which could be safely ignored. It is easy to pass judgment from the sidelines. Let us try to put ourselves in the place of a completely honest and conscientious official who has heard a gentle hint, a half-request, a semi-instruction from certain spheres. Not necessarily celestial spheres but somewhere closer. From the reception room of Comrade Bondarenko, say. You would think a while before ignoring your dignity. What if one day you needed the help of the caller to get in touch with the "boss himself"? Even if the need never arose and you never had to, you would nevertheless feel uncomfortable if you did not listen and take the hint.

Here half, perhaps more, of the responsibility lies with these spheres themselves. Moreover, we know only by hearsay the world of the assistants, aides, consultants, secretaries, and high officials. Who and what are they? What do they do and what rights do they have? At the trial, incidentally, lawyer L. Magid, defending Brovin, raised the question of whether her client was an official. This is not an idle question. Unlawful remuneration is deemed a "bribe" by the law only if it is received by an official, that is, an employee invested with administrative and executive functions. A fitter or milkmaid can be given money unlawfully in return for a service, but that does not constitute a bribe. But what about the secretary or assistant of a senior chief? He has no rights from the legal standpoint but can do "everything." That was superlatively demonstrated by the defendant.

The court ruled that Brovin was an official occupying a position of responsibility. This was not an arbitrary decision—a USSR Supreme Soviet plenum gave appropriate guidance in 1977. But I was thinking not so much about the legal position—"does he have the right"—so much as the actual position—"can he"—about the position of the sizable army of assistants and secretaries to ministerial or local leaders.

I am not just saying this out of courtesy, but the overwhelming majority of them are hard workers. I will not go into who fills these posts, how, for what reasons, and by what routes. Various things are said about them, not always very flattering. But they bear a very heavy load. Quite often they bury their talents and abilities in office routine; fame escapes even those who deserve it: An article in a newspaper or a report for a meeting which they have written and prepared is not published in their name.

But, we will be frank, in the eyes of the lower apparatus the figure of the secretary, assistant, aide, or consultant merges with the figure of the "chief." Without bearing legal responsibility for anything, they have very extensive opportunities, including the opportunity to abuse their position. Conscience ought to curb their actions. But, as someone aptly remarked, pangs of conscience begin only where impunity ends.

This category of workers is certainly very carefully selected. If we take Brovin's position, for example, presumably his curriculum vitae was so thoroughly examined that no tiny blemish went undetected. But how can we establish a person's moral qualities? How are they to be assessed? Certainly not by the standard phrase in character references: "Of good character." I heard Brovin briefly relate his own biography. It was clean, absolutely pristine. Perhaps a perfect curriculum vitae can actually be misleading?

He was in his position for 13 years. He secured it without any nepotism or wire-pulling. The son of a peasant, he had become a worker and studied to be a lawyer. He was efficient, intelligent, with his reputation untarnished. He had no acquaintances in high places or influential patrons. But it was there, in the immediate proximity of power, that the process once known as "degeneration" began. For some reason this word evokes a negative response in me. Possibly because it has often been used to describe the many defeats of many oppositions. But it conveys exactly the essence of what happens to a person.

In fact, Brovin's fall began when he did someone a good turn. The protagonists in this episode appeared before the court, but there is no point in giving their names. A woman from Vladivostok with a hopelessly sick child had turned up on her relatives' doorstep in Moscow after her husband had left her. All her efforts to acquire a residence permit were in vain. Then the woman began to look for other, more devious ways. She reached Gennadiy Danilovich through a chain of acquaintances. One call from him and the matter was solved. He asked nothing for his services and expected nothing. But the "chain" acted of its own accord. They said to the father of the woman concerned: "We must give him something." They suggested two leather coats. So he went ahead and bought them. They gave one to Brovin.

"I asked for nothing, made no conditions, and was amazed when I discovered a leather coat in a parcel sent to me," (the second coat "disappeared" en route) he told the court. I believe him. It was only when he went on to claim that he wanted to return the coat but was unable to do so that I found his words hard to credit. If you want to refuse something you should refuse it point-blank. He wanted to return it but... he tried it on and kept it, as it was the right size.

The next time he was asked to help ensure that a military school student be allowed to remain in Moscow to do his service. Again the request came through a long and complicated chain.

"I rang the general (now dead). I made no demands, I simply asked: Could he stay in Moscow. And I was amazed when I received another parcel."

"What was in the parcel?"

"The sum of R3,000." (They had obtained R4,000 from the parents).

Only Brovin knows whether he had been expecting anything for his services or not. The fact is that he accepted the money. With a very generous interpretation—not legal, of course, but "purely human"—it is just possible to consider the sheepskin coat a gift for helping an unfortunate woman. But R3,000 from an officer's parents, though the money was received after the good turn and was not agreed on in advance, no longer constitute a gift given in gratitude.

But how easy it all is! One telephone call—and everything sets in motion, all the rules and norms are broken, and the person on the other end of the line immediately leaps to his feet at the word "attention." The degeneration spread like wildfire, like a cancer of the soul. What laws can counter the workings of this shadow administration? The "word" from on high immediately becomes "deed." Moreover, it produces its own "snowball" effect of misconduct, appears to give its blessing to transgressions of the law, and conceals them.

It is true that it is impossible to remain at the same level of evil: Once begun, degeneration corrupts to the core. Another witness in the Brovin case was also brought into the courtroom under escort—Zinyakov, former head of the RSFSR Ministry of Light Industry Sewn Goods Main Administration. Like Belkina, he had begun to abuse his official position and was threatened with dismissal. Again, through a roundabout process, first via Babayev, Zinyakov's deputy, and then via Petrosyan, former director of a prestigious Sochi restaurant (he too was brought into the courtroom under escort), he had come to Brovin. On this occasion a promise was frankly made: Save Zinyakov from dismissal and you'll get R10,000.

He made a call to the appropriate quarter, dropped a gentle hint: "Do you really have to dismiss him?" and... Brovin was given R5,000. "I thought we agreed on R10,000," he prompted. They immediately brought the other R5,000. They obviously could have given him even more. Such a useful person to know!

The last charge against Brovin involved Belkina. "Only four charges in all," G. Smirnov, state prosecutor and senior assistant to the prosecutor general, said in his speech, "but they reveal a picture of total corruption. This is a case resulting from the period of stagnation. But the accused, especially Brovin, also created an atmosphere of contempt for the law and morality and elevated lack of principle into a principle of life."

Brovin was sentenced to 9 years' imprisonment and his property was confiscated. Before the sentence was passed he was allowed to make a final statement, this being his due. Throughout the proceedings I had watched him, trying to understand at least something about this person. He represents his time and his "class," so to speak. Obviously, when making assessments, you have to make allowances for the circumstances in which he now finds himself. I could tell that he was overwhelmed. He seemed to confirm as much in his final statement: He said that he had already been severely punished, that he had been greatly shamed, that he was still relying on the humanity of our society and the Soviet court, and that the prosecutor had been too harsh in his indictment.

I have said it once and will say it again: It is hard to judge the conduct of someone in this kind of situation. It is sometimes the case, however, that a man finds the strength to retain his dignity when he stands on the brink, so to speak. Brovin did not appear to find this strength. And did he have dignity "at the time"? Hardly. He was complacent and slavishly omnipotent. He conscientiously performed his duties but had no sense of responsibility to his position; he did not understand the link between duties and "duty." He betrayed his duty and his position. He also betrayed those who trusted him. And he betrayed those who came to him every day on matters which bore no comparison to his "activity" on the telephone.

Against the background of the many crimes which have recently been made public, the four episodes in this criminal case and R19,000 in bribes may seem rather insignificant. But the crux of the case cannot be expressed in quantitative terms. Waves of corruption and depravity were amplified through this figure with an intensity directly proportional to distance. It was through people like Brovin that embezzlers and bribe-takers found a reliable barrier against the sword of justice and public wrath. It is not by chance that I have constantly referred to the "chains" leading to Brovin, or the fact that the witnesses were brought to the courtroom under escort. They were condemned, not for this case but

for others. Confident of the protection of Brovin, they became criminals. Remaining in their official positions, they fostered lack of faith in truth, justice, and the law...

No, our century is not so fearless after all. Because it has been unable to deal with many manifestations of evil. We are only just beginning to revive the dignity of man in general and of officials in particular, through democracy and glasnost. You will agree that only they, perhaps, are capable of really opposing "telephone law" and the power of anonymous opinions, which, although they possibly do not exist, nevertheless until quite recently crushed everything and eliminated personal responsibility.

Surely the very fact that this trial was held must be a source of hope? Everyone is equal in the eyes of the law: This principle has always been enunciated, even during the period of stagnation. However, then it remained a mere principle, legal capital unexploited in practice. Perhaps one of the most important results of restructuring is that the law is being and has been exercised. If anyone entertains hopes of being protected by his position or rank or taking shelter in the shadow of a patron, he is going to be disappointed. Times have changed. Responsibility for any transgression of the law is becoming a fact rather than a slogan.

Commerce, Industry Presidium Chairman Replaced

LD191335 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1150 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, 19 Jan (TASS)—The Council of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry met today to examine an organizational question. Yevgeniy Pitovranov was released from his duties as chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry in connection with his retirement.

Vladislav Malkevich, 52, was elected chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry. For several years he did economic and scientific work at a responsible level in the USSR Ministry of the Radio Industry. From 1971 he worked in various posts in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade. In 1983 he was appointed USSR deputy minister of foreign trade and in 1986 first deputy minister of foreign trade.

Officials Interviewed on Psychiatry Decree

PM151245 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with I. Samoshchenko, first deputy minister of justice, and A. Moskvichev, deputy minister of health, by "our special correspondent" E. Maksimova under the "From Competent Sources" rubric: "On Psychiatric Assistance"; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has adopted a decree "On the Approval of the Provision on the Conditions and Procedure for Rendering Psychiatric Assistance" which will be introduced 1 March 1988. The decree is published in full in the USSR Supreme Soviet gazette and a report on it was published in IZVESTIYA's sixth issue for this year.

Our special correspondent E. Maksimova asked I. Samoshchenko, USSR first deputy minister of justice, and A. Moskvichev, USSR deputy minister of health, to comment on several points of the new Provision—the former on questions of a legal nature and the latter on points regarding medicine and doctors.

[Maksimova] Please describe the importance of the act itself.

"The preparation and adoption of the Provision is among the measures which the party and state are implementing to strengthen legality and law and order," Ivan Sergeyevich Samoshchenko said. "For many years psychiatric assistance has been regulated by departmental instruction. Legal regulation in this complex sphere has now been raised to a qualitatively new level, the level of a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree. The provision enshrines the fundamental principles of the psychiatric service: democracy, socialist legality, humanism, and compassion."

[Maksimova] The document lists important guarantees: legal aid, the assistance of a lawyer, supervision by the prosecutor's office. How is it planned to implement all this?

[Samoshchenko] A system for complaining against doctors' actions to a higher ranking health organ and then to the court or directly to the court has been envisaged. The patient may disagree with the doctor's conclusion, with a refusal to discharge him from hospital, with the extension of his period of treatment there. Incidentally, we must rectify an error made in IZVESTIYA's publication. It is not the decision of the commission of specialists but of an official—the city or oblast chief psychiatrist—which can be appealed against in court.

In general this opportunity of appealing against the actions of psychiatrists is new to our legislation. It will serve as a serious obstacle against abuses. Here the court has great potential: bringing in new documents and facts, appointing a panel of experts independent of local doctors, directing its request as high as necessary—right up to the Health Ministry.

The lawyer will also take part in this. He can defend the patient in other situations, in virtually any institution and any conflict, in the clinic and in the commission. We are proposing to introduce a relevant specification to the law on the legal profession: "The lawyer represents the interests of the citizen on questions connected with rendering psychiatric assistance to the latter."

As is well known, supervision by the prosecutor's office consists in supervision of legality. The provision stresses this essential duty of the office with respect to psychiatric patients.

I want to draw attention to one more guarantee, although it is not of a purely legal nature: Upon a request from the patient, his relations or legal representatives, the examination commission can include any psychiatrist working in a given area.

When the provision starts to be applied opportunities for developing it will probably appear. I accept that something will have to be improved and perfected.

[Maksimova] The Provision includes a point on the doctor's responsibility for hospitalizing a person he knows to be healthy.

[Samoshchenko] Yes, there is a very strict warning. A new article is now being introduced to the criminal code. This crime is punished by imprisonment for up to 2 years or corrective work for the same period with or without the loss of the right to hold certain posts or to engage in certain activity for a period of 1-3 years.

[Maksimova] An important stipulation: "The deprivation of a person's rights or the restriction of his legal interests is not allowed solely on the basis of the fact that he is under psychiatric observation or in a psychiatric hospital."

[Samoshchenko] Solely on the basis... That is the fact itself is not accompanied by any restrictions. A citizen's ordinary rights—for instance, the right to work in his speciality, to adopt children, or to engage in correspondence—cannot be automatically removed. He can be registered [as a psychiatric patient] and still drive a car and travel on responsible business trips. Everything depends on the nature and gravity of the illness or condition. After all, the name of the illness often says nothing, although, of course, there are professions requiring excellent health which have their own lists of "forbidden" ailments. Just as there are conditions for driving a car, possessing weapons, and so forth.

[Maksimova] Now I have questions for you, Aleksey Mikhaylovich. A problem which to this day is giving rise to the fiercest debates is the question of certification and hospitalization without the patient's consent. We must bear in mind, as RSFSR Deputy Health Minister V. Suvorov writes in his reply to IZVESTIYA's article "Without Defense," the "definite pressure from the militia and administrative institutions which has created among some underqualified doctors stereotypes of activity which are not justified by medical ethics," the former closed nature of the topic, and its social echo. All this has made public opinion unfavorable.

[Moskvichev] According to the Provision, psychiatric assistance is a voluntary matter. Emergency aid without consent is the exception to the norm. The grounds for this aid are formulated in general form. For the initial certification—"immediate danger to himself or those around him" and "sufficient grounds for supposing that a psychiatric disorder is present" when there is a violation of public order or the roles of socialist communal living. The first case is obviously clear—a threat to the patient's own health and life or that of someone else. If he has a gun or a knife or has attempted suicide... As for suspicions "giving grounds," then a patient's colleagues, neighbors, or militia may inform the clinic. But it is the psychiatrist and the psychiatrist alone who can take matters further.

Before reaching a decision he must painstakingly examine the arguments, documents, and facts, discern bizarreness in the patient's behavior, and only then... No, he still does not have the right to break into his house. His function is to persuade, to seek a way of examining a person.

As for hospitalization, that is only when there is "immediate danger."

[Maksimova] Is hospitalization without consent permitted for purely medical reasons: It will be better for the patient, he will be treated, but he does not understand that?

[Moskvichev] Not with the aid of coercion, only by persuasion.

[Maksimova] Where will indications for treatment without consent be "interpreted?"

[Moskvichev] In the instructions on which the Health Ministry is now working. Naturally, they must be coordinated with many departments—the prosecutor's office, the USSR MVD, the USSR Ministry of Justice. We are approaching this interpretation, the formulation of typical systems, very carefully, and we are abandoning some of them. In particular, the following stipulation used to exist: "people who disorganize the work of institutions with numerous letters of meaningless content." We will treat such cases with extreme caution. It is by no means medical measures of influence which are needed for purely litigious behavior.

[Maksimova] How do you conceive participation of the medical public in compiling instructions?

[Moskvichev] We plan to publish a draft for discussion in the journal NEVROPATOLOGIYA I PSIKHIATRIYA. We will then publish the definitive version in MEDITSINSKAYA GAZETA for general familiarization.

[Maksimova] The permanent post of chief psychiatrist is being introduced for each republic, oblast, and city with a population of over 0.5 million.

[Moskvichev] Yes, a very important and responsible post; a new figure in our psychiatric practice. Under the Provision he is both controller and arbiter. He is responsible for the most difficult decisions. All cases of urgent hospitalization are reported to him immediately, he examines all conclusions and makes an expert assessment. He "takes measures to safeguard rights... examines statements and complains... and resolves complex and vexed issues." Selecting this doctor will be difficult. He should be a strong diagnostician, an objective and honest man, sensitive and intellectual.

One more innovation: The task of social concern for our patients is assigned to the soviets; housing, work, and other aid. How was it before? The doctor writes a plaintive note about housing benefits and someone may heed it if he wants to, but most often he does not. Or take finding him work: A person is fully able-bodied but he is refused work solely on the grounds that he was relieved of military service because of psychiatric illness. Sometimes people can no longer work in their special field, and where are they to go? The soviets undertake the organization of production with easier working conditions. It is their obligation—that is what is crucial.

[Maksimova] Both the Provision and you, Aleksey Mikhaylovich, in your replies, speak of care and compassion, of merciful ways and methods, of the least restrictive conditions. I have heard that the ministry is embarking on a broad experiment whose aim is the practical implementation of the new approaches.

[Moskvichev] It began 1 January in Moscow, Leningrad, Latvia, Ivanovo Oblast, and Altay Kray. Its thrust is that many people with psychiatric disorders who used to be compulsorily registered at clinics will be removed from the register. Neurotic disorders, neuroses, even an illness such as schizophrenia in its benign forms present no danger to people surrounding the patient. If the patient's condition has not given rise to a drastic loss of his critical attitude toward himself and the world, he can visit the doctor as he wishes—when he needs to or wants to.

A system of criteria has been elaborated. In 2 years' time we will analyze and calculate the social and medical results. If they are promising, we will extend the experiment to the whole country. Already psychiatrists everywhere are setting about reviewing the people under their care—with a view to removing them from the register. There are enough conflict situations and repeat examinations on the basis of the new rules are inevitable. At meetings with doctors now we do not tire of saying that the duration of registration or previous repeated stays in hospital are still not grounds for continuing observation in a clinic when there is no longer any practical need. Henceforth we will put people on the register with far greater circumspection.

Local Party's Handling of Voluntary Club Hit

PM151648 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jan 88 Second Edition p 3

[PRAVDA correspondent B. Glotov report under the rubric "Learning Democracy": "Honest Discussion: It Alone Can Help in the Quest for the Truth"]

[Text] Novokuznetsk, Kemerovo Oblast—An item on the pros and cons of the work of the voluntary society known as the "Vremya Club" had not even gone to press when A. Sosimovich, editor of the newspaper KUZNETSKIY RABOCHIY, was called up by party gorkom First Secretary V. Sitko:

"Show me Belokurov's article."

"Does that mean you don't trust the editor?"

"That's not the point," the gorkom secretary replied. "I am informed that the emphasis is misplaced."

The bureau members discussed the article. The editor was unable to defend the newspaper's view. The article was shelved. Why?

About 18 months ago a voluntary society sprang up in Novokuznetsk—the Vremya Club. Its members, linked by common interests, meet regularly, give lectures, and hold debates on questions that interest them. Workers and engineers, doctors and teachers, and students launched a struggle for a sober way of life. At times they were even aggressive. Those who did not agree with them were subjected to a hail of reproaches, and complaints were sent off to higher authorities. The club members sharply criticized the city authorities too. For instance, a year ago the city trade administration decided to increase the number of "outlets" for the sale of alcoholic drinks. The club members objected. After trekking round the leadership offices to no avail, they decided to hold a protest demonstration. Then party gorkom Secretary E. Tarasova set all her work aside and went to the club. Her conversations are reported below...

After beginning with alcohol propaganda, Vremya widened its sphere of activity: It became involved in problems of ecology and the preservation of cultural monuments. Party and soviet organs might be expected to take an interest in this society. But here, they reasoned: They will make a bit of noise, and then break up. The opposite happened—the club's influence grew. But "outsiders," so to speak, began to become involved with Vremya, people for whom making a fuss about something is more important than what it really means, whose arguments about patriotism have nothing to do with real patriotism. Unfortunately, many people swallowed this verbal sham.

It cannot be denied that an unusual situation had arisen. New approaches were required from party, soviet, and Komsomol workers. For instance, why not organize a debate on the objectives and tasks of such societies, their

rights and duties. Find the correct tone and convincing arguments. But... they acted in the old way: They invited the club leaders to their offices for investigations and prophylactic "scoldings."

During a meeting with club members party gorkom Secretary E. Tarasova accepted no objections, and thereby proved nothing. In fact, one must not see opponents purely as enemies. Agreement was reached on only one point: The expansion of the trade in alcoholic drinks in the city would not take place.

After that, it was decided to rebuff Vremya publicly. Then the KUZNETSKIY RABOCHIY editorial office received the instruction to "slam" the club!

The KUZNETSKIY RABOCHIY journalists are acquainted with Vremya, not only by hearsay: Club members have visited the editorial office and the collective has had the opportunity to become more closely acquainted with their views. Deputy editor L. Savitskaya believes that the society should not be represented entirely in a bad light. Nor did newspaper employee A. Belokurov take that view.

I have met Vremya activists and read A. Belokurov's article, and I came to the same conclusion: It would be wrong to show the club's activity as unequivocally bad.

"Why has not a single party and government resolution of the last 10-20 years been completely fulfilled?" That was the question put to me, for instance, by club chairman G. Kupavtsev, clearly for "effect." This was followed by several more questions that were equally "tricky," in his view. We started to go into the matter. It turned out that it is not hard to find answers to each of these questions: Today the factors that caused the negative phenomena in our society's life have been analyzed thoroughly and openly. The club members did not agree unreservedly with all the points put forward, but some of the arguments, as you could see from the reaction, were listened to attentively. In the end they admitted that it is far better to find the truth through calm, amicable discussion. Alas, people often try to silence them, take them in hand, or even publicly mock them. Yet among the club members there are many thinking people who are sincerely committed to improving things. This is what they say, for instance.

B. Sharapov: I do not understand why the city leaders regard the club members only as people who are "pushing their noses into other people's business." They say to us: If you are an antialcohol society, why interfere in questions of preserving cultural monuments, or ecology? But why not?

A. Nurdybayev: Like all city dwellers, we are worried about the difficult, strained ecological situation. But for some reason, people tend to say: If these questions are being raised officially, that is, through appeals by the gorkom and gorispolkom to higher authorities, then "spontaneous" intervention by the public is inappropriate. Yet we have the same aim—to make the air cleaner in Novokuznetsk.

Here is the opinion of P. Velichko, executive secretary of the city council of the Temperance Society: The club members are quick off the mark, they are prepared at any time to go to the other end of the city to conduct a debate or give a lecture.

All this was spoken of in the article which prompted the debate. But it seems that the author's main "sin" was to allow himself to make critical remarks about party workers.

"The club members should be criticized, not us," party gorkom Second Secretary A. Lenskiy believes, "they take too much on themselves. They set themselves up as judges: Such-and-such is wrong with our city..."

Where are the differences of opinion? In the view of the voluntary activists, the struggle against drunkenness in Novokuznetsk is mainly verbal. In discussing this subject at the party gorkom and the gorispolkom, they produce their "trump cards": 10,000 people took part in Temperance Day, and citywide raids take place.

No doubt they do, but despite the "scale of operations," the harmful habit is being eradicated only slowly, and statistically the city is still the "heaviest drinker" in the oblast. The intolerance initially shown toward drunkards has become indulgence.

For instance, KUZNETSKIY RABOCHIY printed a critical story about V. Grigoryev, chief of the Metallurgical Combine Railroad Transport Administration. While in hospital, he summoned a bus from his enterprise and held a collective drinking session together with the medical personnel. The drunken outing ended badly. They were caught, severely drunk, by a raid team. The administration chief himself and his assistants V. Lukyanov and I. Zinchenko behaved brazenly and threatened the people who detained them. What was the combine party committee's assessment of this case? They appeared to react: Grigoryev was severely reprimanded, with an entry on his record. But the compromised chief continued to head the collective. The members of the Vremya Club condemned such leniency.

"It is none of their business. They have no business interfering in intraparty affairs, we can handle it ourselves," was A. Lenskiy's assessment of the situation.

However, it was not only members of the Vremya Club who came out against attempts to shield the compromised leader. The newspaper published several letters in which indignant inhabitants of Novokuznetsk said bluntly: Grigoryev and his ilk have no moral right to lead people. The party organs had to heed public opinion and remove Grigoryev from his post.

By all appearances, the gorkom secretary is nostalgic for the days when disagreeing with his opinion was seen unequivocally as impermissible and was cut short with a threat or administrative pressure. The widening glasnost has emancipated people's self-awareness, and the time of "labels," as well as of threats, is over.

I think the journalists are right: An objective publication on Vremya's activity is needed; perhaps even a debate, so as to explain the nature of the misconceptions and errors of certain activists.

"We do not consent to the publication," is the gorkom's view. "We let it happen once, but not this time!"

It seems that on one occasion KUZNETSKIY RABOCHIY decided to reprint an article from SOBESEDNIK in which Novokuznetsk was criticized for poor work with young people. On learning of it, E. Tarasova tried to prevent the reprinting. Why worry people again, she asked? All the same, the item appeared, and evoked many reactions. There was a keen exchange of opinions on the problems of youth education...

Now, because of the party gorkom's position, an opportunity arises to use the newspaper as a platform for a frank discussion of youth problems; a much needed discussion.

Kirghiz MVD Chief Outlines New Glasnost Policy
LD172124 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 17 Jan 88

[Text] Now, comrades, (Aleksandr Mirtov) our correspondent in Frunze, describes an interesting experience of work of the Kirghiz SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

[(Mirtov)] Readers of the republican paper SOVETSKAYA KIRGHIZIYA spotted right away that a column entitled "Militia Telephone 02" began to appear since the start of the year in almost every edition of the paper, on its fourth page. It contains the latest information about crimes and infringements of the law that have been committed, about measures being taken against those who do not live on the right side of the law. In a word, the ministry, within the bounds of what is professionally permissible, informs those who live in the republic about the work it does. This not infrequently also includes materials about abuses which some internal affairs employees unfortunately still allow to take place.

It is, of course, a matter of pleasure that glasnost and democratization have begun to affect a department whose activities have, still quite recently, been swathed in the greatest secrecy, as it were. This, not unnaturally, used to give rise to idle conjectures and rumors.

The ministry has recently arranged for a direct telephone line to be set up. Any inhabitant of the republic could dial the number he found in the newspaper and put his question directly to the minister. I asked Major General of Militia Viktor Vasilyevich Goncharov, Kirghiz minister of internal affairs, to comment on this:

[Begin Goncharov recording] All the questions put by the working people of our capital and the countryside reflect their concern about the state of affairs in the republic—above all their concern about the state of public order, about our shortcomings in ensuring road traffic safety, in preventing and putting a halt to the practice of making illicit alcohol which is becoming more widespread, about the errors and instances of neglect on the part of those employed by the Militia. They have shown that there are still many shortcomings here. More than 90 questions were put to us today in the space of only 3 hours. We have yet to analyse these questions and, of course, we have to give replies in each specific case, either directly to the authors of these questions or through the SOVETSKAYA KIRGHIZIYA daily.

I think I speak for all the comrades who took part with me in this direct telephone link when I say that it is a beginning for our further creative work. [end recording]

Further creative work—this phrase, used with regard to a republican Ministry of Internal Affairs, well, you know, comrades, only 5 years ago it would probably have sounded like those sweet rose pastilles which long ago disappeared from the stores. But today, just look: a direct telephone line, an admission of shortcomings and errors in work—it is a pleasure to hear such words. Not all that much remains to be done!

Krasnodar Officials Struggle With Prostitution
LD141739 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 14 Jan 88

[Text] The problem of the struggle with prostitution in Krasnodar Kray is the subject of an interview by our correspondent Vladimir Obraztsov with Aleksandr Georgiyevich Sapunov, deputy chief of the Ministry of Internal Affairs Department of Krayispolkom:

[Begin recording] [Sapunov] Mainly, prostitution is registered in port cities—Novorossiysk, Tuapse; in the resort towns—Sochi, Gelendzik; and in the kray center of the city of Krasnodar, where a large number of foreign students are studying. We had been fighting this evil even before the last 2 years, when open discussion began about it. We have been involved in the problem of prostitution since the beginning of the seventies, especially in the cities of Sochi, Novorossiysk and the city of Krasnodar. Now, this problem has simply come out into the open, newspapers and magazines have begun to write about it.

[Obraztsov] The problem has come out into the open, and statistics have been revealed. You can now mention the number of prostitutes in Krasnodar Kray.

[Sapunov] In Krasnodar Kray at the present moment officially there are 267 prostitutes.

[Obraztsov] A prostitute—what is her social profile like, who is she?

[Sapunov] If we take those who are registered, it is a woman aged between 18 to 30. The general age is 18, 20 years old. One under-age prostitute is registered in the city of Krasnodar.

[Obraztsov] Do they work or study?

[Sapunov] Mainly, they are workers in trade and industry, public catering, workers of the resort directorates. The recently issued statute of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium envisages liability for the pursuit of prostitution, administrative liability is brought to bear. We are now determining our work in accordance with it—the number of those detained, those warned, those who are brought to administrative account. But unfortunately the aforementioned statute envisages a small type of punishment. If the prostitute is detained for the first time, she is punished with a fine amounting to R100, if within the course of the year she is detained a second time—R200.

[Obraztsov] Right now let us compare. What is the maximum earning of a prostitute in 1 day that you know of?

[Sapunov] One cannot answer this definitively, but I can say that on average, according to our materials, it is determined at 200, 250 or 300 rubles.

[Obraztsov] In other words, such a form of punishment as a fine amounting to a part of a day's work is simply not effective.

[Sapunov] Exactly. But what is even worse is that today we do not have the concept of prostitution and of a prostitute in the legislation. This makes our preventive work more difficult. Not only I, but my colleagues also put this issue forward in the pages of newspapers and magazines because once the concept of prostitution begins to exist, in accordance with this, responsibility will be increased accordingly. We expect this today from our legislators. [end recording]

Changes in Environmental Protection Viewed

LD190018 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Our observer comments on the Soviet leadership's decision to drastically change the manner of environmental protection in this country:

The more we are concerned about our health the harder we try to do something about it. The same holds true of environmental protection. Since ecological problems were hushed up for a long time we have now come face to face with these problems. Openness and democratization in society helps to look for the effective ways to solve them. Some bold steps have been taken recently to protect nature. Work has been stopped on the project to divert the northern and Siberian rivers southwards and the plans are being totally reexamined. Great efforts are being made to protect the unique Baykal and Ladoga Lakes. The use of toxins for processing cotton have been prohibited.

The public has had the crucial say on the matter of ecology. In taking the decision the leadership took public opinion into account. The decision actually means a turn from the settlement of local conflicts with nature to the formation of a single state ecological policy. New approaches to environmental protection and the rational use of natural resources are geared to new trends in the national economy and thrifty economic management. Without a unified state antipollution service we often face facts of violation—some quite serious. A state committee for the protection of the environment is being set up to reverse the situation. This body will have extensive powers. Its activity will above all be aimed at fulfilling the long-term national program of environemtnal protection and the rational use of natural resources up till the year 2005. Ecology experts will scrutinize economic development projects. This will be an important measure. The new antipollution service will strictly control compliance with antipollution regulations in the development of new technology and will have the right to suspend its application.

The industries and farms that previously polluted the environment with impunity now face the risk of bankruptcy in the current conditions of cost accounting and self-management. The government is introducing such a system of heavy fines and sanctions that the timely building or improving of purification facilities will be more lucrative than to continue to damage the environment. Payment for the use of natural resources also comes into effect as part of the new economic policy. Coupled wth the principle of cost accounting this measure is to induce the producers to minimize environmental pollution. And pricing will be used to stimulate the production of ecologically clean output. In short, economic levers will be applied in the interests of nature and society.

Incidentally, the public now has many more opportunities to control and influence the solution of ecological problems. In this respect, ecological education gained greater significance. A new publishing house, Nature, and a weekly newspaper of the same name are being set up and a special course on ecology will become part of the school and college curricula.

In its antipollution policy this country proceeds from the universal importance of this work and calls for broader international cooperation.

Roy Medvedev on Dubcek's L'UNITA Interview

PM181426 [Editorial Report] Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian on 12 January carries on page 11 a 1,000-word Fiammetta Cucurnia interview with Soviet historian Roy Medvedev pegged to the interview with former Czechoslovak leader Alexander Dubcek published by the PCI daily, L'UNITA, on 10 January. Medvedev is quoted as follows on the subject of parallels between Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the USSR today: "There are undeniably profound similarities between the Soviet 'new course' and the Prague Spring—similarities in the principles behind the 'Action Program', in the basic objectives that characterized Prague's 1968. However, there are equally great differences—first and foremost, concerning the tactics for implementing this program—which must not be underestimated.

"In Prague in 1968 there prevailed trends and approaches that Gorbachev now defines as 'political adventurism.' The changes acquired an excessive, explosive, rapidity. In our societies such rapid rates of renewal can only cause irremediable splits and ruptures between the leaders, the promoters of the process and the population. Impulsiveness and a certain degree of improvisation inherent in the 'Prague Spring' still constitute a very serious danger that absolutely must be averted if the restructuring is to be carried out successfully. Indeed, as often happens—especially in our country—haste unsupported by a sophisticated political capability can cause more harm than good.

"I believe that Gorbachev's strength—and that of his program—lies precisely in the great shrewdness and flexibility that he has displayed hitherto. It is enough to consider that in 3 years of restructuring the changes that have come about in the USSR are far fewer than those introduced in Prague in 1968 within just 6 months. I believe this is a better choice that offers better chances of success."

On a personal note, Medvedev is quoted as saying that "both human and political solidarity must certainly exist between Mikhail Gorbachev and Dubcek. Many members of the Prague group were personal friends of Gorbachev's. Many of his present advisers still feel ashamed about the Soviet invasion, though they could not show it at the time. Even Gorbachev cannot have become the man he is overnight. His ideas have developed during a whole lifetime. When he talks about the need for 'more socialism' he is referring explicitly to the 'socialism with a human face' for which Dubcek is remembered."

With regard to the impact of Soviet restructuring on other East European countries, Medvedev is quoted as saying that "There are countries such as Romania, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia where the 'radical reform' proposed by Gorbachev in the Soviet Union poses an objective problem because they are not economically or politically ready to tackle it. Nevertheless the wind of change blowing from the Kremlin cannot fail to have an impact on those countries' social atmosphere, economic structures, and aspirations to glasnost and democratization. The attitude toward people such as Dubcek, who have never disowned socialist principles but who have on the contrary fought and paid a personal price to defend them, must necessarily change. For this to be possible it is important to stress the fundamental differences that exist between restructuring and the Prague Spring, the 'non-traumatic' nature of the reforms whereby Gorbachev intends to achieve 'socialism with a human face.'"

Milan L'UNITA in Italian on 12 January carries on page 2 an 800-word Roy Medvedev commentary on the Dubcek interview. In it, Medvedev says among other things: "I consider Dubcek's interview disappointing in various respects—first, on account of his refusal to engage in any proper self-criticism and a proper analysis of all the accumulated causes that led to the defeat of the 'Prague Spring' and that are not rooted solely in the Soviet occupation. For me the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia represent a combination of political boldness and political blindness, enthusiasm and euphoria, the rejection of Gottwald's and Novotni's dogmas and stereotypes, but also the rejection of correct assessments and forecasts connected with Czechoslovakia's international position and its place within the socialist camp." Medvedev concludes by saying that "Of course Dubcek is fully entitled to demand that he be treated differently and that a fairer assessment be made of his work. He was never either a 'right-wing revisionist' or a 'tool of international action', a 'victim of Zionism' or a 'representative of the antisocialist forces.' Gustav Husak and Brezhnev's propaganda used these descriptions on innumerable occasions during the seventies. The present reappraisal of Soviet domestic and foreign policy must in time also lead to a condemnation of the 'Brezhnev Doctrine' and of the Warsaw Pact countries' intervention in Czechoslovakia. The new leadership of the USSR and CPSU is starting to build the foundations of new relations not only with the western countries but with the socialist countries too."

Economic

Bogomolov on Financial 'Experiment' in Ukraine

LD151029 Moscow TASS in English 0914 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Kiev January 15 TASS—The Lvov "Conveyer" factory undertook to provide itself with credits for industrial and social needs by borrowing from workers part of their savings.

The participation inself-crediting is a purely voluntary affair. General meetings were held in all subdivisions of the factory and an overwhelming majority of personnel spoke out in favour of the novelty.

It was decided to put a two-month sum of wage rate or salary on the bank account of the factory. Besides, those who wish it may contribute a third monthly pay to the account. The invested money will annually produce twenty per cent of interest. (It must be mentioned for comparison that the amount of interest on the working people's deposits in the Savings Bank of the USSR is two-four per cent per annum).

The investor may use the additional contribution and interest on it at his discretion at any time. The worker has the right to withdraw all of his money when he quits the factory.

A TASS correspondent has asked Oleg Bogomolov, a prominent Soviet economist, director of the Institute of the Economics of the World Socialist System, to comment upon the experiment in Lvov.

The economist regards the experiment as highly promising.

"The 'Conveyer'", the scientist explained, "is a thriving enterprise. The factory has received no unsatisfactory equipment reports over the past five years. Profit has considerably increased, and allocations to the funds of the enterprise have grown. Naturally, the earnings of workers and engineers rose to become higher that the average indicator in the engineering sector".

"At the same time, working from the beginning of 1987 on the basis of self-financing and cost-accounting, the factory personnel saw for themselves that the economic reform being effected in the Soviet Union did not automatically resolve all the arisen problems".

"Unforeseeable situations, connected, for example, with the market situation, the discipline of deliveries, and the mastering of advanced technology, quite often develop in the new conditions. This is why it is essential to have a reserve of funds. At the first stage of the restructuring, the work collective will help to create such a reserve". "The organization of this kind of 'joint-stock' enterprises", Academician Bogomolov emphasised, "may subsequently lead to the formation of a cooperative form of ownership in the industry of the USSR, to a kind of renting of the means of production from the state, which by no means contradicts the principles of socialism".

"By entering into co-ownership of fixed assets, the worker to a greater extent than before feels that he is a manager of production and is personally interested in an increase in incomes and a rise in the prifitability of the enterprise. This has an effect on his attitude to the equipment, to the expenditure of the feedstock and materials, and to the perfection of his professional skills".

"To me, there is no such question as 'more socialism or less' in the Lvov experiment", Academician Bogomolov said. "Everything that serves the dynamic development of production and the realisation of the creative initiative of the working people is of benefit to our social system".

'Problems' of Perestroyka To Air Biweekly

OW181615 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0520 GMT on 15 January carries the first issue of "Basics of Economics," a 30-minute program devoted to the problems of perestroyka; the program will be broadcast during the 2d and 4th weeks of each month. The program is introduced by A.B. Mozhin, candidate of economic sciences, who says: "The program will be broadcast twice a month. The main purpose of the new program is to provide specific answers to specific questions."

The program begins with a video clip of an unidentified journalist interviewing Academician A.G. Aganbegyan, who says: "We are now entering a new stage, a stage of transition from talking, to getting ready to embark on the real thing, to undertaking large-scale action. This is the stage of implementing our ideas and reaping the harvest of perestroyka. Yet individuals remain the most important aspect in this whole process."

He continues, saying that "restructuring is taking place for the benefit of man and is, in turn, dependent on the human factor. It is important that our specialists' professional knowledge be augmented by economic knowledge, because the main target of perestroyka is the economy."

The program then cuts to an interview with S.A. Lukyanov, head of EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA's advertising department. The interviewing journalist, who is not identified, asks whether, under the new conditions, enterprises will not find it necessary to quickly dispose of excess stock and other assets to maximize their profitability and whether it is likely that the demand for advertising will increase in the future. Lukyanov agrees that demand for advertising space will increase and does not rule out the possibility that more television time will have to be devoted to advertising. At this point the program cuts to a clip of a television advertisement appealing to "businesslike" people to increase the profitability of their plants by availing themselves of television advertising.

The program then returns to the interview with Aganbegyan, who recounts the various skills that will have to be mastered by the new generation of managers, such as how to arrange financing, the problems associated with economic accountability, market studies, and other such problems. Speaking about new methods of teaching economics, Aganbegyan stresses the need to promote such qualities in managers as being enterprising and creative and displaying greater initiative.

Aganbegyan continues by explaining that under the new laws the production plan for a given enterprise is dependent on three factors: orders placed by the state, orders placed within the industry, and contracts an enterprise enters into of its own volition. Aganbegyan is then asked about the relationship between these three factors, who determines their proportions, and whether an enterprise's initiative is hindered by these factors. Aganbegyan responds that "we are now entering a transition stage" because the innovations are being introduced in the middle of a 5-year plan, which means many enterprises are in the middle or under the influence of schedules worked out several years ago. He says that these and other factors have created a situation whereby "we are making the transition to new economic conditions under very harsh limitations." Aganbegyan says that in the future orders placed by the state will be severely curtailed and limited to goods of "state significance." These should not exceed more than 20% of total orders: consumers will be placing orders themselves. For this system to work, however, a "new price system, wholesale trade, and other such innovations must be fully developed. "

Aganbegyan notes orders placed by the state are still generally regarded as a burden rather than as a profitable and desirable contract, as it is in the West. It is necessary to create such conditions that enterprises and plants will compete or bid for state contracts. This is the ultimate goal.

The program then cuts to an interview with Academician Oleg Timofeyevich Bogomolov, who speaks of "emancipation of the thinking process," which frees the concept of private and public ownership from the narrow interpretation of previous years. Under present conditions, says Bogomolov, there is room for "state, cooperative-kolkhoz, and individual ownership, as well as mixed forms of ownership and even state-capitalist ownership, as is about to come about in joint enterprises with representatives of Western capital." He goes on to describe the changing concepts of property, ownership, and means of production, which—contrary to the opinion of some—remains firmly in the hands of the state. To the question, "Does all this mean more or less socialism?" Bogomolov replies: "More socialism means that production is developing more dynamically, that science and technology are progressing and that—and this is the most important aspect—the prospects and opportunities for everyone within a socialist society are increasing." On the other hand, if productivity keeps falling and free expression is limited, then there is less socialism.

Mozhin concludes by saying that the program intends to draw the viewers' attention to interesting economic events and interesting articles in popular or academic publications.

Cooperatives' Methods, Main Concern Reviewed

PM191145 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 2

[A. Protsenko "Commercial Review": "Stores With the "Co-op" Emblem"]

[Text] In the past they were hard to find in cities. In the whole of Moscow, for instance, as recently as 3 years ago there were only six small cooperative stores which sold pine nuts, bear meat, soaked cranberries, partridge, mushrooms, and sunflower seeds. In many of the country's cities there were no cooperative stores at all. Then suddenly it was as if an epidemic had broken out: Old food and delicatessen stores were hurriedly closed for repairs and reopened under the familiar "Co-op" sign.

Now there are already more than 21,000 such stores in the country. Their turnover will reach R8.7 billion this year. The range of goods in consumer cooperative trade outlets includes everything that is produced on the land, above all on private plots. And also meat, sausages, and canned foods. The prices in cooperative stores are considerably higher than in the state trade network and sometimes even higher than the prices charged at markets, and this has been immediately noted by consumers who have flooded the editorial offices of central newspapers with their letters. The main question asked in the letters is: Is what is happening perhaps an attempt to replace state trade with cooperative trade; are these not real if unannounced food price increases?

Let's try to analyze this question with the help of information obtained at the Tsentrosoyuz Main Administration for Cooperative Trade.

Let us take a look at meat and poultry prices in cooperative stores in the past year. The average price in the country as a whole did not exceed R4 per kg—this does not reflect quality differentials: Fillet steak cost more, of course, and spare ribs less. Meat was most expensive in Azerbaijan (R4.84 per kg) and Uzbekistan and Tajikistan (R4.76 and R4.74 per kg, respectively) and least expensive in Belorussia (R1.78 per kg), Estonia (R2.87 per kg), and the Ukraine (R3.02 per kg).

The state trade prices are lower, of course. It must not be forgotten, however, that meat in the state trade network is subsidized to the tune of several billion rubles a year, while consumer cooperatives operate on profit and loss principles. Furthermore, we must take into account that the consumer cooperatives do not themselves produce any agricultural products. Their function is to act as middlemen between the producer and the consumer. The conditions here resemble free market conditions most closely, and in these conditions short supply leads to the diktat of the seller who says—if you don't want to buy at my price, I'll take my wares to the market and sell them at an even higher price.

It would be logical to argue that in these conditions cooperatives should encourage the production of meat at subsidiary farms in every way. After all, the more producers there are, the lower the purchase price. In many areas, however, it is simply disadvantageous for consumer cooperatives to sell meat. Not long ago the Tsentrosoyuz complained that party and soviet leaders at the

local level are demanding that cooperatives sell meat below cost price. In Tomsk Oblast, for instance, beef is sold at R3.60 per kg when it costs R4.60 to produce. On the instructions of Kuybyshev Oblispolkom the oblast consumer cooperative union has set the retail price for beef at R4, which is 50 kopeks below the cost price. The same thing is happening in Rostov Oblast, in Kazakhstan, Moldavia, Kirghizia, and Bashkiria, and in many cities.

The losses incurred as a result of meat sales must be covered somehow and, as a result, prices for cooperative sausage products are rising. In 1985 the average price for sausage products in the country as a whole totaled R5.94 compared with R6.57 last year. The prices for sausages are, of course, rising above all wherever meat prices have been kept artificially low. In Georgia, for instance the administrative pressure would have meant losses in excess of R30 million for the cooperatives had they not countered with the highest prices for sausage products in the country—R10.43 per kg on average.

Our readers (judging by the mailbag) would very much like to know how various kinds of sausages and canned meats produced at state enterprises come to be sold at cooperative stores? If cooperatives sell produce bought from the population, where does the imported canned meat come from that they have on their shelves complete with cooperative price labels? Have they bought it in China perhaps?

The answer is that the rapid growth of the cooperative trade network in cities was not sufficiently well-prepared. At present the Tsentrosoyuz annually procures 1.5 million tonnes of meat in slaughter weight. According to current rules livestock and poultry raised on private plots and delivered to kolkhozes and sovkhozes rather than consumer cooperatives is also classified as cooperative since it is not subsidized by the state. In this way the Tsentrosoyuz gets a further 300,000 tonnes of meat annually without, it is true, doing much for it.

Cooperatives would be very glad to process all this meat into sausages or canned meats. The demand for them is not subsiding and the advantages are obvious. However, the Tsentrosoyuz facilities make it possible only to process less than half this raw material and produce only 320,000 tonnes of sausages and 60 million cans of processed meat. Therefore part of the cooperative meat is processed at meat combines belonging to the agro-industrial complex. The latter settles its accounts with the cooperatives in kind—that is, in sausages and processed meats which are exactly the same as those delivered to the state trade network. This "uniformity" was exploited last year by the Rostov Potresoyuz: In an effort to improve its financial situation it did not shrink from selling—at cooperative prices—Chinese canned meat purchased from the state trade network. This practice has now been condemned, but the incident itself reflects the abnormality of the prevailing situation: It would be better if the cooperatives processed their own products without supplementing them with state trade and agro-industrial complex products. It must be said that steps are being taken to rectify the situation. Several hundred small meat-processing enterprises have been bought abroad, and it is planned in the future to have a sausage factory in every rayon.

In the coming year the cooperatives' main concern will be taking control of the markets. At the moment the Tsentrosoyuz is completing formalities for their takeover from local trade organs and is embarking on their expansion and reconstruction. The new managers of the markets are planning during the current year to bring down the price for early new potatoes and to increase deliveries of vegetables and fruit at prices 25-30% below market prices. To this end trade-and-procurement enterprises which will buy up excess produce from the population in surrounding villages and deliver it to cooperative market stalls are being set up directly at the markets.

Belyanova on Plan, Market Polemics of Twenties

PM191115 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 2, Jan 88 (signed to press 7 Jan 88) p 17

[Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Belyanova article under the rubric "From the History of Soviet Economic Thinking": "The Discussions of the Twenties"]

[Text] In his report "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Continues," M.S. Gorbachev said that the past cannot but excite the minds of our contemporaries. Addressing the past enables them to discover both firm spiritual support and instructive lessons.

Of course, historical experience cannot provide ready-made answers to all questions that have to be resolved at the present stage. But it does make it possible to perceive the causes of both our achievements and our losses, to guard against the mistakes and failures allowed to occur in the past, and to obtain a better understanding of today's problems.

The history of the development of economic science in our country contains quite a few interesting pages. One of them covers the period of the twenties, abounding in acute ideological struggle and wide-ranging scientific discussions on various questions concerning the theory and practice of building socialism.

Soviet economic science was developing in difficult conditions at that time: The lack of historical experience in socialist building complicated the elaboration of scientific methods for the management of social production, while the processes of transformation proved to be much more complex than imagined and did not fit into the assumed timespan. Complexities were also created by the fact that economic science during the transition period was represented by various schools and trends of economic thinking—Marxist, bourgeois, and petty bourgeois.

Rushing ahead in the assessment of actual processes of building socialism, doubts as to the correctness of the chosen path, and exaggeration as well as disparagement of successes in the socialist transformation of society were all typical of economic thinking during that period. The actual processes occurring in the economy produced amendments to scientific forecasts and forced scientists to amplify and at times even to revise their positions.

This was most graphically demonstrated in the approach toward the question of the historical fate of commodity-money relations under socialism.

Having correctly posed in principle the questions of their changing position and role in the conditions of the planned economy, many economists failed to perceive immediately the need and possibility to make broad use of them in building socialism. The specific historical features of the post-October period helped the emergence of models of socialism which assigned secondary importance to commodity relations and substantiated the possibility of transcending them as early as during the transition period.

It is well-known that the conversion of economic relations to an in-kind footing had spread widely by 1920. The overwhelming proportion of payments to workers was in-kind, while municipal services, transport, communications, and public entertainment were free.

Many perceived this as a law-governed transition to the cashless economy. It was this period that produced the idea of the withering away of political economy as a science which studies the "blind laws of the market." This idea was outlined in N. Bukharin's book "Transition Period Economy." Describing commodities, money, profit, and wages as categories of the capitalist economy, he claimed that they refuse to serve us even during the transition period. Even though economic practice still uses these categories, their conventional nature must not be forgotten: Commodity turns into product and loses its commodity nature, money undergoes a process of self-negation. Money ceases to be a universal means of exchange and turns into a conventional turnover indicator. The law of value is replaced by the law of simple labor expenditures.

V.I. Lenin's remarks regarding this book are widely known.

But economic thinking did not halt at an understanding of the position and role of commodity-money relations prevailing during the years of war communism. Evidence of this was provided by the transition to the New Economic Policy (NEP), which presupposed broad use of commodity-money relations for the socialist transformation of society.

By the mid-twenties N. Bukharin was already admitting: "...if our former impression of the development of the socialist system consisted of the view that, right after the dictatorship of the proletariat, we would destroy the market and would thus immediately destroy the capitalist economy and immediately introduce a planned economy—then we were mistaken."

But certain "excesses" also proved unavoidable: Total rejection of commodity-money relations was replaced by demands for their full and totally unrestricted freedom, by the proclamation of the law of value as the basic law of Soviet economics. These were the conditions which produced the slogan "Get rich!", addressed by N. Bukharin to all strata of the peasantry, including the kulaks. He sharply condemned the policy of dekulakization, holding that the violent expropriation of kulaks' property was "theoretically incorrect and nonsensical in practice," while envisaging the process of cooperativization of the broad masses of the peasantry primarily in the circulation sphere.

Approximately identical positions were taken by old-school economists like V. Groman, N. Kondratyev, and V. Bazarov. V. Bazarov for example, urging the utmost development of market relations, was against any restrictions on kulak farms, holding that the "squeezing out" of the kulak class must take its "natural" course—the course of their farms' declining efficiency against the background of the socialist sector's growing successes. In external relations he aimed for an "open" economy, linking the monopoly in foreign trade with the country's economic weakness. In the specific historical conditions of the building of socialism, recommendations like these encountered sharp rejection both by party organs and by many Soviet economists.

A different concept of economic development was presented in the works by Ye. Preobrazhenskiy, one of the theoreticians of Trotskiyism. The mechanistic approach toward the transition period economy was typical of him. Having singled out two sectors in it—the state (socialist) and the private sectors (with the latter including all categories of peasants' farms in the countryside)—he perceived them as isolated, opposed and hostile to one another, and developing according to different laws: The private sector is governed by the law of value, while the state sector is governed by the law of initial socialist accumulation.

The essence of the latter boiled down to exploitation of "nonsocialist forms of economic activity" in towns and countryside via the expropriation of the entire surplus product and part of the necessary product for the benefit of the state, which ought to gradually lead to the "swallowing up" of the private sector by the socialist sector. The extreme positions on a number of problems of socialist building advanced by Preobrazhenskiy were subjected to sharp criticism in party documents and discussions at the time.

It must be noted at the same time that some of the methods allowed to be used in the actual process of

socialist transformation of the countryside were essentially in harmony with the demand to take from the peasantry whatever was within the limits of the "economically possible and technically attainable."

This divergence between "words" and "deeds" leads to serious reflections on the relationship between economic theory, economic policy, and economic practice. Only their correct interaction is capable of successfully leading to the goals of socialism and avoiding outrages against reality which, as historical experience proves, always involve a high cost to society.

But the practice prevailing until quite recently prevented a broad circle of specialists from studying individual works and documents dating back to the twenties. This created additional difficulties along the path of learning the truth about the past, and often produced nonobjective and superficial assessments of individual personalities and of their role in the development of economic theory and socialist building.

Conditions are now being created to ensure that the next step in the interpretation of the traveled path is taken from positions of the historical experience of the development of socialism in the USSR and the other socialist countries and on the basis of primary sources. Furthermore, it is necessary to turn time and again to Lenin's ideas about socialism and Lenin's assessments of historical events of the time and of individual personalities.

The pages covering the elaboration of the foundations of the planned economy occupy a particular place in the history of economic science. Work on the creation of a system of plan management of the expanding social production was launched in the very first years after the October Revolution under V.I. Lenin's leadership. Particular attention in this work was given to the elaboration of the foundations of long-term planning on a society-wide scale.

Marxist scholars were aware of the complexity of the tasks facing them. Guided by Lenin's ideas on long-term planning, they produced a substantiation of the need to create an integral planning system including long-term (general), 5-year, and annual plans. Within this system, the 5-year plan was just a section of the general plan, elaborated on its basis and containing amplifications of set tasks. Stressing the difficulty of solving this task in the immediate future during the discussion on the 1st 5-Year Plan, G.M. Krzhizhanovskiy remarked that the date of the creation of such a general plan will have to be entered in the calendar as a red-letter day for working people all over the world.

The ideas of long-term national economic planning were also widely discussed in capitalist countries at that time. In the conditions of impending world economic crisis, the possibility of planned development was proclaimed to be "an economic fantasy," while the 5-year plan was proclaimed to be "a numerical fairy tale." The meaning of the words "gosplan" and "pyatiletka" [5-year plan] at the time was as clear as that of "perestroyka" today, without any need to translate them into other languages.

It is no secret that, at that time, many scientists and practitioners held pessimistic views on the idea of long-term planning, referring to our economy's state of extreme deformity and the absence of any planning theory. The method of discovering empirical laws, precluding the radical and violent demolition of prevailing macroeconomic proportions, was held to be the only acceptable method for building long-term guidelines. Even those who recognized the need for planning tried to reduce it to nothing more than a possibility to forecast the consequences of market processes, and assigned the role of "modest superstructure" to the targeted method in planning.

There are two trends among economists of that time that can be singled out from the viewpoint of the approaches toward interpretation of the essence and laws of the socialism that was being built and the methods for running the country's economy.

The first is represented by economists relying on the legacy of Marxist-Leninist classics. They tried to define the ways and methods for the development of socialism proceeding from its inner nature and the fundamental features of the new social system. A particular position in their concepts was taken by an analysis of the advantages brought by the new social system. N. Voznesenskiy, L. Gatovskiy, V. Milyutin, V. Motylev, E. Kviring, N. Kovalevskiy, G. Krzhizhanovskiy, S. Strumilin, and G. Feldman rank among these economists.

The second trend must include economists who gave priority to the general laws of material production, denigrating and at times even ignoring the specific features of the new method of production and the conditions of socialist building in our country. This led to the building of models of economic development which were not in conformity with the tasks and goals of the socialism that was being built. A tendency toward perception of production as nothing more than a technological process, regardless of its social forms, united the scientists of this trend with economists of the bourgeois hue.

In a simplified form, these two trends represented the two basic approaches toward the study of economic processes—the so-called teleological approach which was based on targeted directives, and the genetic approach which was based on market processes of economic development.

Ideological differences between them at times led to extremes: "Geneticists" made demands for complete and totally unrestricted freedom of market processes.

"Teleologists," on the other hand, rejected the existence of objective economic laws under socialism and gave the plan the status of basic economic law of the socialist economy.

Moreover, the advocates of both methods maintained that theirs was the scientific approach toward the processes of the Soviet economy's development. The stance of the "genetic" approach was presented in its purest form in V. Groman's works. His absolutization of the role played by the extrapolation method in the approach toward the prospects of the national economy's development resulted in rejection of the possibility of demolishing national economic proportions, primarily the proportions between agriculture and industry, rejection of fast rates of social production growth. In polemics with economists of that hue, S. Strumilin upheld the need for targeted approach toward the development of the country's productive forces. Speaking at the discussion on the 1st 5-Year Plan, he said: "We are not indifferent regarding the direction of the development of these productive forces. We want them to develop in the direction of socialism. We are setting ourselves a definite task that they should develop, first, in the direction of socialism, and second, in the direction of boosting the working people's prosperity."

Of course, the broad discussions on problems of the theory and practice of socialist building in the twenties did not always produce a solution to the complex disputed questions. In these arguments, the problem of the correlationship between plan and market turned into a statement of alternatives: either plan or market.

The question of the correlationship between plan and market is being discussed within scientific circles to this day, involving not only specialists but also all who are interested in economic problems. The discussion of these problems in the twenties offers much food for thought.

It is certainly impossible to squeeze all economists of that time within the simplified scheme of either "genetic" or "teleological" approach. For example, scientists like G. Krzhizhanovskiy, S. Strumilin, V. Milyutin, and V. Motylev, who stand at the origins of planning theory, can be ranked among the advocates of the "teleological" method only subject to numerous provisos. At the same time, it is hardly possible to unreservedly class as "genetic" the stance taken by V. Bazarov, whose works contain many interesting statements on the problems of long-term planning, or N. Kondratyev who headed the Institute for Market Studies at the time. For example, in an article on the methods for elaborating long-term plans written 60 years ago, Kondratyev pointed out the fact that even the capitalist economy, governed as it is by market economy laws, cannot fail to feel the effect of the state's economic policy.

Due credit must be given to Kondratyev who, while not a Marxist, managed to perceive the objective need for plan management of the economy proceeding from the premise of socialized labor and production. One can only be amazed by the fact that nowadays some economists perceive the plan management of the economy not as an advantage of socialism but as its major shortcoming. One can and must speak of the shortcomings of planning, but one must not go to extremes which could reproduce past mistakes—the rejection of objective law-governed phenomena. Of course, bad planning, just like bad utilization of commodity-money relations, can only inflict damage on society. The task at the present stage of our development concerns the improvement of planning, which also presupposes improvement of the methods for utilizing commodity-money relations.

A special position in the broad discussions on problems of socialist planning is occupied by the discussion on the working hypothesis of a general plan elaborated by a commission headed by N. Kovalevskiy. An active role in this work was played by G. Feldman, a talented scientist who elaborated economic-mathematical methods for the long-term forecast of economic processes in the twenties.

These were certainly just initial steps in the elaboration of a scientific system of socialist planning. Its authors did not claim any more than this, aware that the improvement of the planning system is a continuous process reflecting the consolidation of the planned nature of production and the changing objective conditions of socialist economic management.

Briefs

New Power Plant

Construction workers in Azerbaijan are preparing to build a new power plant on the Kura River. Meanwhile, the construction of the Yenikend power plant continues. The basic preparations for the new power plant will be completed by the end of this year. When completed, the new power plant will generate 380,000 kilowatt hours of electricity. This output equals the capacity of the Shamkhor power plant. [Summary] [*Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 13 Jan 88 NC*]

Caspian Sea Oil Extraction

The first well to be drilled in the new Aralik oil field in the Caspian Sea has been sunk by the (?Sherk-3) oil rig. The rig was brought to the Caspian Sea from [name indistinct]. A total of 200 tons of oil will be extracted daily from the 4,000-meter well. [Text] [*Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 13 Jan 88 NC*]

Agricultural

January Weather, Crop Status Reported

PM191529 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 Jan 88 p 3

[Agrometeorologist S. Malikova report: "Weather and Crops; Have the Buds on the Fruit Trees and Bushes Swelled Too Soon? The Winter Crops Still Need a Snow Cover"]

[Text] In the USSR's European territory in the last 10-day period unusually warm weather was observed. The maximum air temperature in the majority of regions was 1-5°, in the Baltic region, Belorussia, Moldavia, and in the greater part of the Ukraine 6-10°, and in the Crimea, Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays 12-18°. The average air temperature for the 10-day period was 4-9° above the perennial average. Precipitation occurred everywhere. The warm weather caused the snow cover to melt and to compact. In the Baltic region, Belorussia, in the Ukraine and the Northern Caucasus there was no snow in the fields.

In the western and southern areas of the Ukraine, in Moldavia and in Krasnodar Kray where the soil had thawed all the way through, the winter grain crops started growing again. The buds on the morello cherries, the sweet cherries, currants, peaches, and other fruit crops started swelling. In Estonia, the Smolensk, Kaluga, Bryansk, Orel, Kursk, Belgorod, and Voronezh Oblasts, north of Rostov and Volgograd Oblasts the snow was 1-3 cm deep but there were no heavy frosts, and the wintering of the winter grain crops proceeded favorably. In the Northwest Region, in the remaining oblasts of the Central and Central Chernozem Regions, in southern Volga-Vyatka Region and in the northern area of the Volga Region there was more snow and the conditions for the wintering of crops were satisfactory.

In the Transcaucasus republics in the middle of the 10-day period it grew warm, the maximum air temperature on individual days was 12-17°. In the majority of regions there was no precipitation or it did not exceed 5 mm. The winter grain crops grew for most of the 10-day period, and they were only dormant in Armenia.

In the agricultural regions of West Siberia and in Kazakhstan the average air temperature for the 10-day period exceeded the perennial average by 5 to 10°, and a thaw was observed. The greatest amount of precipitation (11 to 30 mm, and in places more) occurred in the Kemerovo Oblast, in the majority of rayons in the Novosibirsk, Tyumen, and Omsk Oblasts, north of Altay Kray, and also in the southeastern oblasts of Kazakhstan. The winter grain crops and perennial sown grasses are under snow cover which is mainly 25-35 cm deep and more. Their wintering is proceeding favorably.

In the Far East the average air temperature for the 10-day period was close to the perennial average. In the majority of regions there was 1-5 mm of precipitation. The snow cover was mainly between 15 and 25 cm deep. The soil froze to a depth of between 60 and 120 cm.

In the republics of Central Asia the average air temperature for the 10-day period exceeded the perennial average by between 1 and 4°. The greatest amount of precipitation (11 to 30 mm, and in places more) occurred in Tajikistan, in northern Kirghizia, and in the eastern half of Uzbekistan. In Kirghizia the winter grain crops for most of the 10-day period were dormant, and in the remaining republics of Central Asia they grew. The buds of stone fruit crops are continuing to swell in the southern regions of Uzbekistan.

Briefs

New Winter Wheat Strain

Moscow, 19 Jan (TASS)—Seed-breeders at the Institute of Cytology and Genetics of the Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences have developed a strain of winter wheat that can withstand the harsh Siberian winter and that gives a maximum yield of up to 40 quintals per hectare. The Albidum strain has a high protein content and was bred by crossing wheat and couch-grass. The properties of the wild grass endowed Albidum with resistance to low temperatures and to disease, characteristics that the developers enhanced by irradiating the seeds with gamma rays, which do not affect the consumer qualities of the grain. Vladimir Shumnyy, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, told the TASS correspondent that the new strain will become the basis for even more productive strains for harsh climatic conditions. [Summary] [*Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1010 GMT 19 Jan 88 LD*]

Scientific

Soviet Shuttle To Be Launched 'Soon'

LD201024 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 20 Jan 88

[Text] It's been announced here in Moscow that a Soviet space shuttle is soon to be launched in the USSR. This was stated at a press conference by Aleksandr Dunayev, head of Glavkosmos of the USSR, devoted to the recent long-term flight of Soviet cosmonauts on board the orbital complex Mir.

'Mir' Cosmonauts Continue Experiments

LD191301 Moscow TASS in English 1232 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov are continuing their missions aboard the orbiting platform Mir.

Yesterday they conducted a series of experiments involving the ultra-violet telescope Glazar and aiming to obtain data about short-wave length radiation from astrophysics objects in the constellations Leo and Ursa Minor.

In keeping with a program for geophysics research, the crew took a series of readings of the spectral characteristics of individual sections of the surface of the earth. One of the purposes of those studies was to determine the extent to which the world's oceans are contaminated with oil products.

Today Titov and Manarov will be mostly busy doing scheduled maintenance work aboard the platform. They are to replace pickups which are at the end of their service lives.

Both cosmonauts are feeling well.

The flight of the platform Mir is proceeding normally.

Gromyko Presents Awards to 'Mir' Cosmonauts

LD182131 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Jan 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] A group of cosmonauts were presented with medals today. Yuriy Romanenko expressed his gratitude for the esteem with which the party regarded his work on the Mir station, and his thanks to the engineers and others who had made the flight possible. [video shows Demichev, standing by Gromyko, then focuses on cosmonauts as they are named]

Addressing those given the awards, Comrade Gromyko said:

[Begin Gromyko recording] "The distinguishing feature of the flight which has now ended was that it was the longest in the history of the conquest of space. Soviet citizen and hero, Airman-Cosmonaut Yuriy Romanenko, member of the Leninist Party of Communists, spent 326 days working in near-earth orbit. This sounds like science fiction, but it is reality. It is an outstanding and many-sided contribution to science and practice connected with the mastering of space. First, for half a year, Flight Engineer Aleksandr Laveykin worked fruitfully in the Mir station together with Yuriy Romanenko, as subsequently did Aleksandr Aleksandrov for 160 days. Both of them fulfilled the tasks set by the motherland with honor. Airman-Cosmonaut Researcher—and today he is a hero—Anatoliy Levchenko coped successfully and worthily with his duties.

"Very recently, historic step was taken which opened up the path to achieving a nuclear-free world—the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles was signed. The people of the earth have conceived the hope that a reliable barrier will be set up to the militarization of outer space. Our country's new success opens up even wider opportunities for international cooperation in studying and harnessing space.

"Dear comrade cosmonauts, allow me to wish you from the bottom of my heart good health and happiness. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev sends you his cordial greetings. Pass on our congratulations and greetings to your friends and relations." [applause]

[Moscow TASS in English at 1402 GMT on 18 January in a similar report adds: "Yuriy Romanenko, pilot-cosmonaut of the USSR, Twice Hero of the Soviet Union, received the Order of Lenin, Aleksandr Aleksandrov, pilot-cosmonaut of the USSR, Twice Hero of the Soviet Union—the Order of Lenin and the second 'Gold Star' medal, Aleksandr Laveykin and Anatoliy Levchenko, pilot-cosmonauts of the USSR, Heroes of the Soviet Union—the Orders of Lenin, the 'Gold Star' medals and the breastplates 'Pilot-Cosmonaut of the USSR'."

Research Ship Leaves for Antarctic

LD152153 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1635 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Summary] Leningrad, 15 Jan (TASS)—The research ship Mikhail Somov, the last member of the 33d Soviet Antarctic expedition, has set off for the Antarctic from Leningrad. Five scientific and transport ships have already made the journey this season.

The Mikhail Somov has undergone major repairs following 12 polar expeditions and a period 2 years ago when the ship drifted in the Ross Sea for 133 days. Its powerplant has been replaced and its hull renovated at the Turku shipyard, and its scientific equipment has been modernized.

The ship will be conveying researchers to the Bellingsgauzen and Novolazarevskaya stations, stopping en route at Rostock to take on participants in the GDR's first Antarctic expedition. Their task is to make the Georg Forster station—which was built with Soviet help near the Novolazarevskaya station—habitable.

The Soviet expedition is to be joined this season by Bulgarian scientists under an agreement between the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control and Sofia University. Soviet specialists will be helping the Bulgarians to choose a site for a permanent station.

The Mikhail Somov will be returning to Leningrad in the summer.

Military

Yazov, Writers on Education of Army, Public

OW180722 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2215 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Meeting between Defense Minister D.T. Yazov, General Colonel D.A. Volkogonov, and a group of Soviet authors headed by V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the Board of the USSR Union of Soviet Writers, at the Ministry of Defense on 15 January 1988—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [A.B. Chakovskiy, author] Comrades, there is one thing that bothers me. I do not wish to exaggerate this, but recently, sometimes in magazines and at other times in books, we have found stories on the contemporary army in which internal military life is depicted in a most unsightly way. This could lead to very unpleasant results—a diminished desire to serve in the Armed Forces, a burning desire to be done with the service, and so forth. This, comrades—though I don't wish to frighten anyone or present this as the number one danger, for there are other dangers that are more real—is undoubtedly a danger. Therefore I would like to call on the Main Political Directorate and the authors themselves—this depends on us as well—to not forget that historically the Armed Forces have always been sacred to us.

[Yazov] We are not avoiding this question. But let us first allow Comrade Volkogonov a word and later we will return to this question.

[Volkogonov] You have noted that the press, television, and the authors themselves often depict our contemporary army in terms of gigantic cigar-shaped ballistic missiles, flashing screens, and super powerful motors. Indeed, all this is true. The wave of scientific and technical progress has captured our imagination. The military has changed, as has the soldier. The man in uniform has also changed. These changes are the result of the changes in society on the one hand—the only thing that remains eternal in the world is constant change itself—and the changing functions of the Soviet Armed Forces, on the other hand. These functions have became enriched. We used to constantly say in the past that the Soviet Armed Forces exist for the defense of the socialist fatherland. Indeed, this remains the Armed Forces' main function to this day. But at the same time, today the Soviet Armed Forces also exist for the defense of the socialist community, a role that is being fulfilled by the Soviet Armed Forces in conjunction with the fraternal countries. Appropriately, the Soviet Armed Forces also exist for the purpose of rendering help to progressive regimes and national liberation movements. Most important, though, is the fact that for the first time in history the Army has become not an instrument of force but an instrument for peace. The role of the Army today—on a par with the defense of the realm—is the preservation of peace. Therefore, the changing function cannot avoid leaving its imprint on the soldier—on the man in uniform.

What then is the social profile of our contemporary soldier? First of all is the Armed Forces' social composition, which naturally, is the same as for the rest of our society. It should be noted, however, that the large majority of our people never serve in the Armed Forces. Never in their whole lives. Forgive me for the expression, but there are many who have never had to pull on a pair of military pants. There are such people.

We certainly have problems that suggest that not all is as it should be in our armed forces. We have instances which we shamefully call "irregular behavior" [ne ustavnym vzaimootnosheniya]. In essence these are twisted relations between servicemen with varying seniority. Yes, this problem did not occur yesterday. It occurred some 25 years ago. At the beginning it was not of a malignant nature—say a form of hazing after the young soldiers were sworn in. Gradually, it acquired the force of tradition. The secret of any tradition is in the information which is passed on from generation to generation, from call up to call up. This tradition has become so refined that now, in some units, on some ships—I wish to stress that this is not the case everywhere—quite often long serving soldiers are attempting to transfer some of their difficult or unpleasant duties onto the shoulders of the young soldiers. At the same time they propagate a simple ideology: Your turn will come. Often this translates into insults against human dignity, rudeness, and even various physical encounters and collisions.

It would be wrong to say we are not struggling against this. But I emphasize that without all of us participating—in the family, school, on the production line—this problem is extraordinarily difficult to solve. Here we are faced with cultural interrelationships, problems associated with glasnost and, I would even say, the inculcation of self-esteem, the role of the family, and parents. These problems are gradually being solved.

As you see, I only touched on several aspects. We have many problems. Literature, real literature, cannot exist without the presence of conflict. [passage omitted]

In conclusion, I wish to say that in illuminating our Armed Forces, it is important for us to stress that there is only one truth, be it for a soldier, a marshal, or a general. This is discussed quite often, and ignoring it could lead to incorrect political decisions. One further point: It is sometimes said that literature on the contemporary Army is little more than bureaucratic literature. But surely, the defense of the fatherland was never a matter for the bureaucracy. It is not a matter for the Ministry of Forestry. The defense of the fatherland was, and remains, a sacred cause for all of us. This is what Comrade Chakovskiy spoke of. This is all I have to say.

[Karpov] [Passage omitted] Perestroyka is taking place in the economy, in politics, and in the social spheres. If it could be said that the results of these changes in industry and rural productivity will be felt in 5 or 10

years, then we, the authors, have already benefited more from perestroyka than any other sector. We have acquired the main thing, and we did not have to wait until the end of perestroyka to acquire it: glasnost.

There is a great deal to be found in the life of the military— adventure, the joy of service, heroic deeds both in time of war and peace, the strength of military comradery, and mutual assistance. All this exists today. Nothing needs to be invented or made more presentable or palatable. What is more important is that the time has arrived when it is possible and indeed necessary to forcefully write about this. Thank you for your attention.

[Grigoriy Baklanov, writer] We are being called on to perform great tasks. Only a politically and morally unified people can perform great tasks. I wish to say the following concerning this. Many of the things said here today are true. All our deeds, and not just our literature, contribute to education.

Right now, our soldiers are returning from Afghanistan. I keep getting letters from the invalids, from the wives of those killed. We are treating them poorly, even shamefully [nekudyshno]. When we [Soviet World War II veterans] returned as invalids, some with serious, others with less serious disabilities, the nation was in a terrible state; there was no one there to rebuild and we had to do everything ourselves. But this is not the case now. When there is lack of attention for one invalid or to the widow of a fallen soldier, this too educates the young but not in a desirable way. This requires the most serious attention. [passage omitted]

[Aleksandr Prokhanov] Attacks by certain sectors of our culture on the military are, in my opinion, shameful. This is because our contemporary culture, which has repented and in all truth is sincerely sorry for the years of stagnation, cannot be compared with the military that during the same period of stagnation managed to achieve military-political and strategic parity with the United States. We have nothing to blame the Army for. The military is now in need of moral support. A certain section of our intelligentsia, quite sincerely—and this is perhaps a good thing—is attempting to present the Armed Forces and its representatives as a conservative element that encompasses the internal opposition to the dynamic processes we are now experiencing.

A certain section of our intellectuals are appropriating achievement of the reduction of intermediate-range missiles to themselves, and argue that the growth of pacifism and peacemaking awareness is responsible for wrestling the missiles from both the Americans and our own military. This is not the case. [passage omitted]

[Yazov] Esteemed Comrades, it was you, the authors, who began the discussion about patriotic education, and I am sincerely grateful to esteemed comrades Yuriy Bondarev, Vasiliy Belov, and Valentin Rasputin who, by their article "Is It Easy To Be Young?" have provoked a discussion by a large number of Soviet participants—the young, adults, adolescents, and the middle-aged. Everyone is now debating this topic.

Indeed, is it easy to be young when, during the course of a day, a person is subjected to a landslide of information, making it difficult for a young person to select all that is needed for his education, with the result being that he takes everything indiscriminately? Under these conditions we should discuss what kind of information is desirable—books, poetry, stories, what should be presented on television.

What does Ryazanov say? He was asked: Do you believe in God? He tried to wiggle out: You know, it is not that I believe... I am an atheist myself, but,.... you know, I believe in something.

Can one educate the young, growing generation on this basis? Should we really be starting with the gods? When the church was strong, Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy, together with Lermontov, was burnt in the fiery furnace—those who have visited the Kazan Cathedral would have had the opportunity to see this. [Yazov refers to well-known painting] Now we have Ryazanov himself. This man did not serve in the Army, everything seems to have been easy for him, and he thinks that this is the way we can educate people. Now the matter lies not only in a military-patriotic education in general, but primarily in the education of the youth, and getting the youth accustomed to work.

Some comrades were quite correct in what they said: Some families have one child, some have two, but that is the maximum. They do not get their children accustomed to work, nor to anything else for that matter. So they do not want to do anything anywhere, including in the Army. But in the military, there is equality among soldiers, and in the main, irregular treatment is directed primarily against those who do not want to do anything. We are constantly studying this question. The problem is not with the excessive incidence of irregular treatment in the Army, but in the number of literate people who later write about this. I receive letters daily—hundreds, even thousands of them. We analyze these letters and visit these places, and nothing is confirmed. Merely the fact that someone has written about something does not make it true. Some people write merely to make their mothers weep, to make them visit. They write that they are beaten unmercifully—and she rushes over and spends money unnecessarily.

Some people do not want to serve. It is hard, and he has not seen anything in his life, nor experienced anything. So what kind of young people are we raising? I am not saying he is not a patriot; he is not even a man yet. He is a person who is afraid to do something, to do something for himself. He is afraid to get his hands dirty. [passage omitted]

Today we are having a candid discussion on political, organizational, or any other topics, so I will be frank with you: Do not think that everything is so bad in the Army. We are not saying all is well. Ideally, we do not even want to have isolated cases of deviation from the norm and such things. But I would like to answer Aleksandr Borisovich Chakovskiy that we do not sentimentalize in the Army; those who break the oath of enlistment or the law are subject to a trial. However, we try to educate. We remember the party has instructed us that the Army is a school of education, and we must educate. One cannot, however, educate people in a vacuum. Education should be implemented by means of certain tools. We continue to regard literature as the main educational tool.

How did the book by Vladimir Vasilyevich Karpov, "The Eternal Battle", help me personally in my practical activities? I noticed that in the military districts where reader conferences on the book were held, the discipline among the officers and in the regiments was generally higher. How is this explained? Simply, to make daily demands—come on, come on, come on—is, apparently, not as effective as example and experience. While we are speaking about the experience of the Great Patriotic War, all of you were quite correct in saying this experience should be used more effectively, in particular for the education of the younger generation. Yegor Aleksandrovich Isayev correctly said: We have only had 25 years to build. Yet today we speak about parity with the United States. In what way did parity become a burden for the people? Because of the high price of technology, and the main goal is to have the kind of Armed Forces capable of guaranteeing peace. This, then, is the task.

One, however, may have the technology, but not have selfless and loyal people. The danger lies in the fact that this selflessness and loyalty could be eliminated by such discussion of eternal truths.

I think this is our common task. It is the task given by the party. To educate people, to cultivate in them, primarily, the belief in their own power, in the might of the power of our socialist state, the superiority of the socialist regime over the capitalist. [passage omitted]

Imperialists dream of a situation where our country has no Koshevoys and Kosmodemyanskayas [heroes of the Great Patriotic War]. They were deeply insulted when Nadya Gurchenko closed the door to the cockpit [during a hijack attempt]. They are deeply insulted when our young men, if need be, fight to the last man in Afghanistan.

Some journals attempt to bite the Soviet Army whenever they can. Here is an issue of OGONEK. [Yazov points to an issue of OGONEK and then begins criticizing a story carried in it about a private named Kolya] "Here is to..."—a habitual toast of an alcoholic. What obscenity! Why was it necessary to connect this alcoholic to a general? "Here is to the shoulder-boards [epaulets] of a general" was Kolya's standing joke about life. "Life is like a general's shoulder-boards—not a single bright stripe to be seen anywhere." [Referring to the absence of gold stripes on a general's epaulets] Kolya is usually proud: "The shoulder-boards are clear, and my conscience is clear," he says [referring to the fact that Kolya is a private and there are no epaulets on his uniform]. He does not toady to anybody.

What has all this got to do with an alcoholic and a general? Is there an OGONEK representative present? Are you ashamed? I think the OGONEK people, if present... [Yazov interrupted by applause] [passage omitted]

A decision was made to call up students of tertiary education [for military service]. Look at the way LITERATURNAYA GAZETA burst forth: Oh my God, if one is to serve as a soldier, then he will never be a mathematician! He [points to one of the authors present] was a soldier and became an author. Many of you were first officers and soldiers, and then later became authors. "He will not be a mathematician or scientist; he will not be this or that!" [mimics LITERATURNAYA GAZETA]

I ask you, at what was the propaganda of the imperialist states directed immediately after the war? At tearing off the laurels of our victory—is this not so? We aided them in this and are still doing so. Many tremble with excitement when they get hold of a fact: Now I shall give one to them! [Yazov interrupted in mid-sentence by break in transmission]

I am grateful and thankful to the many comrades for their criticism of the Ministry of Defense in respect to award presentations. Indeed, such award presentations have educational value. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA was not reticent about publishing several examples of military commissars breaching the law and tolerating ignorance and negligence, and allowing presentation of decorations via third persons or, alternatively, presenting these at inappropriate times. We are fighting against such things. Luckily, about 6.5 million frontline veterans are alive and well today. The great majority of them—probably, 98%—have received decorations and about 2% will do so in the near future. We hope to complete the presentation of awards by the 70th anniversary of the Armed Forces.

There are many problems which could be discussed. I would like to ask you to please approach this problem of youth education and the inculcation of patriotism in people the way authors should. Today, one may very well get by. But if there is a war tomorrow, everyone will have to take up arms. During the Patriotic War one had only to take a rifle in one's hands and learn to use it, which was easy. One, two, and that was all there was to it. Now, to operate a radar, to take charge of a modern plane, or to drive a modern tank without appropriate training is impossible. Contemporary machinery is equipped with computers and instruments. Is it necessary to train a man to program this computer? Of course. Will an

untrained patriot be able to drive a tank and score a hit? Just as a pianist must practice every day, so must a tank driver train daily so that he can, with the aid of instruments, direct the guns to the target. Many things are being changed in all spheres of a soldier's labor.

There is now hardly anything that cannot be found in the army. Many think the army is a mere parasite. No, comrades, it is not so. We have a construction plan that is greater than that of the two construction ministries. That is how much we appropriate for the construction of military, civil, social and cultural, and other objectives. Nobody delivers milk or meat to Novaya Zemlya, Chukotka, or other" pleasant" places of this kind, but people also live there, although they are referred to as families of officers. There are children in those families, and we provide for these families. One often forgets about an officer and his family. Yekaterina Trubetskaya and Mariya Volkonskaya [wives of exiled Decembrists] followed the Decembrists to Chita, which is now a beautiful city. Nekrasov wrote a poem about the wives of officers presently serving in Afghanistan, but nobody ever says a good word about those in Novaya Zemlya or Chukotka.

You owe us a lot, a lot. We also owe you. Let us jointly work on education of the up-and-coming generation. Let us work jointly on making our fatherland stronger. In this will be our unity. I agree with all the speakers that power lies in unity. Allow me, esteemed comrades, to thank you for coming here. I think that we, perhaps, should meet more often. I would not object if you expressed a wish to be invited to a regiment. I would not object to preparing contemporary maneuvers and demonstrating contemporary equipment to you. I think we have nothing to hide from authors—the engineers of human souls [Gorkiy's expression]. Neither of us have anything to hide.